

DEVOTION
AND
REASON,

FIRST ESSAY.

WHEREIN
Modern Devotion for the
Dead, is brought to solid Prin-
ciples, and made Rational ;

In way of Answer to M^r J. M's
*Remembrance for the Living to pray
for the Dead.*

By THOMAS WHITE, Gent.

*In quo quemq; inuenerit suus nobilissimus dies,
in eo eum comprehendet mundi nobilissimus
dies.*

Aug. Epist. 80. ad Hefychium.

PARIS; MDCCLXI.

D. J.

DEVOTION

AND

REASON

FIRST ESSAY

IN

Modern Devotion for the

Dead, is brought to John Pinn

and to the Rational

In way of answer to M. F. M's

and to the Rational

for the Dead

By Thomas White, Gent.

As the sacred and most holy name of

Angels, Saints, and Holy Spirit

THE SECOND



P R E F A C E

To the Gentleman who sent me
Mr. J. M's Book.

S I R,

PEradventure you may desire as well
my Judgment of Mr. J. M's Book, as
the answering of it. In Brief then. The
man I knew many years ago, and conceived a
good Idea of his honesty, and such Learning as
could then be expected from him. He went af-
ter beyond the Seas, where (as I heard) he
follow'd other studies, and at his return I saw
him once, but had a good Character of him
from a common friend, as touching his Ho-
nesty. For, as to his Learning, either my
friend had not try'd it, or we had no occasion to
discourse of it. With this Character of his
Person I undertook the reading of his Book. In
which I find all the Arts necessary to the d-
fending

P R E F A C E.

*ending of a bad cause with as little shame as is possible. He brings known Heresies for his defence: of lawfull Authours he stretches their Persons to the height; their words beyond their extent; if he lights upon an Authority of some Church Book, you would think it were the Definition of a General Council, he so presses the Authority of the Church for it. By Interpretations and Translations he makes them say what he list. He imposes upon his Adversaries Erroneous Doctrin; sometimes because he hath not taken the pains to understand them, and other times, because otherwise his cause would be openly gone. He specially presses my opposition to Popes Bulls, as aiming, by confirmation of them, to have me censured. Of two, the one he corrupts, the other he understands more like a Banquier then a Divine, and yet sets his rest upon them. Most of his Arguments are from places common to both sides. A great weapon with him is, to tax his Adversaries Arguments as employed by Hereticks to prove Errors; not knowing that it is a principal Method of gaining Science, to use the Arguments of extreame Errors to conclude the middle Truth, a way much practised by Aristotle, and very laudable. For as Aristotle teaches there is no famous Error without some truth in it, seeing with us them of
Truth*

PREFACE.

Truth, Nature could not receive it. He hath made a Collection of good and bad; I think of as much as can be said, but seems to make no distinction between those that have some weight, and those which have none. His Answers are sometimes the admitting of plain Contradiction, sometimes admitting of all we say, and for the most, some difference in words more then in meaning. Yet he brags fearfully of his great Exploits and Triumphs. When he pleases he explicates my opinions in disguised Language, and ordinarily imperfectly. I hope his Book will prove the decision, if not of the cause, at least of the handling of it. He hath had two great Advantages against me. One by which a witty Spanish Preacher called Padre Mancio overcame his cor rival to a Sermon in a Country Parish. For putting him to say his Pater noster in Latin before the People to try his learning, when his cor rival said it right, he would correct him according to the false pronunciation of the common People, which the People applauding preferred him. So your Author has the Advantage by explicating Spiritual things corporally, to have the apprehension of ordinary, both Men and Divines; and consequently the applause for him. The second is, that he hath commodity of Books, which to me, being a stranger, and unknown, and in a Town not extraordinary

P R E F A C E.

extraordinary bookish, are hard to find, for which reason I am fain to be content with the faults his citations afford, without being able to give so ample satisfaction as the seeing of the works themselves might have made me able to exhibit. Yet all this doth not cause me to make an evil apprehension of the man. I know the nature of the cause, and the perswasions he hath been imbued with, must needs have this effect, that he must help himself by all the means he can, and very likely is conceited that he doth Sacrifice to God in making my opinion seem the worst he can: His way of Piety, his instruction to handle Divinity by the Authorities of Authors whose Votes have no force, his Obedience, and the Utility of his Friends, all drive him to this. I on the other side am forced to treat sometimes his opinions rudely, sometimes his Arguments, because the English Tongue makes our Controversy exposed to such Judgments, as are to be told what the nature of proofs or sayings are, and well it falls out when even after telling it they be able to see it. But I do not desire any of my sayings should reflect upon his Person, for his Learning be seems well enough the Narrative Divinity that he hath followed, which hath no deeper root then whether some Classical Author (under which nation comes many a mean Divine) hold such

PREFACE.

such an opinion: and, if some Number hold it, then it is Canonized for good Doctrin. But it is not my Theme here to declaim against the weakness of vulgar Divines, but to recommend my pains and self to you, desiring yours and your friends opinion of them, and of

Your ever Friend
and Servant

Thomas White.

FIRST

TRIAL

such an opinion: and I have always held it
then it is a Capital Crime to be punished
is not my Opinion but is a Crime against the
weakness of our own Disposition to be
my price and left to your judgment and
your private opinion of them, and

Your ever friend
and servant

Thomas Paine

FIRST

FIRST PART.

Refuting the Arguments from Authority, and Reason, against the Doctrin of the Middle State.

FIRST DIVISION

Containing what in the first four Chapters concerns the Authour to answer.

The Adversaries misrepresentings of the Author's Doctrin, and mistakes of the Council of Trent. His Arguments to prove that some Saints of the Old Law reassum'd not their Bodies, drawn from Authority and their remaining Reliques, shown inefficacious and springing from shallowness in Philosophy.

S I R,

1. ♦♦♦♦♦ HE Book you sent me, put
♦ T ♦ me in mind of a punishment
♦ ♦ St. Hierom reports to have
♦♦♦♦♦ been used to some Martyrs;
whom first the Pagans anoint-
ed with hony, and then exposed to be tor-
B tured

2 Devotion and Reason.

tured with flies and gnats. For so it serves me; first it declares my opinion reasonable candidly; It testifies that I aim at shewing the Fabrick of the World to be a perfect work of *Wisdom*, and not a wilfull and arbitrary government. Thus far is *Hony*; for, if I do perform it, questionless I play the part of a good Divine; if I do not, at least he gives me the commendation of intending it. Some parts of my opinion he explicates not well, but I conceive it is out of mistake. One thing he fumbles in which was plain enough. Whereas I put in a sin three parts; the strong and resolute Affection, Reliques in the Soul after the resolution is changed, and lastly the outward Action; and give to all these for punishment their severall proper effects, so that the Resolution, which is properly the Sin, may be forgiven and cancell'd, and yet not those effects which follow the other two parts; so that part of the pains remain due after the sin is forgiven; and if this had been plainly deliver'd, it would have cut off his chief imputation, that I say *the sin being forgiven there remains no punishment due*; he was fain to frame such a piece of nonsense, as you may see in his third Chapter, N. 3. &c.

2. This being understood, I may proceed

to his fourth Chapter; in which out of Scripture he pretendeth to prove the deliverableness of souls out of Purgatory before the last day. His first proof out of Scripture is to cite Scripture for that, in which we both agree; to wit, that some pains remain due after the sin is remitted. So that his argument must be purely out of reason, Scripture serving but for a stalking-horse, and indeed in this point is utterly unserviceable to him. But, whencesoever it be drawn, let us see the force it carries. The Council of Trent accurseth those, who say *a man cannot satisfie God for temporal punishments due after the sin is remitted by fastings, &c.* (where we are to note there is never a word spoken of Purgatory.) Therefore, (must he infer to make it carry fully home to his designed point) *We may satisfie for souls in Purgatory.* Two things be wanting in this Argument; One is some Speech of one Persons satisfying for another, for the Councils words seem to be plainly of a man satisfying for his own sins; The other is, that there is no mention of any satisfaction for the sins of the dead. So that the whole Argument is nothing, but his own assertion or supposition. The rest of his Texts of Scripture are drawn after the same trifling manner, having never a word wor-

thy the explicating; but, their sayings being plainly common to both parties, he frames some weak Argument under them; the which being out of pure Reason I expect to find hereafter, where he pretends to bring Reason for his Opinion.

3. In the mean while I may pass to the fifth *N.* where there comes into play another question. For so he argues, Christ in his resurrection delivered souls out of Purgatory, therefore their acts were changed from acts of grief into acts of joy, and this without any change made in Body. He proves the Antecedent largely, nor will I dispute it with him. But the consequence I must utterly deny. For both in *St. Mat. 27.* it is expressed, that *many rose, and came into the holy City, and appeared to many;* And, if we do consider that the gifts of God are perfect, or, as Saint Paul terms it, *sine penitentia*, we will easily see that it cannot be rationally thought that they ever dy'd again, specially they rising in glorify'd Bodies, for else they would have been *publicly seen*, and not *appeared onely* to whom they listed. Besides that the Union to the Body perfects the very beatifical Vision, and if they had dy'd again, they should have lost that perfection once possessed. If again we consider that

Devotion and Reason.

5

no apparent difference is mention'd in Scripture why *some* should have that bliss, and particularly that *many* should enjoy it, and not *all*, we shall find this priviledg fit for *all*; and if for *all*, then that *none* were changed without some change in their Bodies. And, that I may not speak this without Authority, I call him to witness, who was present, our Saviour Jesus Christ, in the fifth of St. *John*, where he makes mention of two resurrections, the one of onely good which he sayes to be at hand, the other of all both good and bad which was to come, in both which he was to be Judg as he was man.

4. He would perswade a man that the position of saying, all the Just of the Old Testament rose with our Saviour, was so absurd that no man would say it, though he had read it in my Book, and comes prepared to oppose it; which he doth, or may do out of divers Histories of the Reliques of some of the Ancient Fathers yet extant, or at least found long since our Saviour's Ascension! But I wonder that a man of so much Criticism as he either is, or I mistook him to be, should never consider what the power of History is, and what it can witness. Take the stories of the invention, or translation of the Prophet *Samuel*, History can testify there

was carryed from *Hierusalem* to *Constantinople*, a Body with great solemnity; That the body was said to be *Samuel's*, and for such presented; That it was found in a Tomb, which was by some probable tokens held for the same, in which *Samuel* was buried: But that the Body was truly *Samuel's*, is beyond the power of History to testify. For History can testify nothing but what men can witness, nor men witness more then they can hear or see; Nor could it be judged either by eye, or ear, whether this was the true body of *Samuel*, or no; Therefore History cannot assure us of any of the examples which he brings against our position, and the truth must be resolved either into probable conjectures, or to some obscure revelation, neither of which is sufficient to make a Theological Argument.

5. Yet, because I will not discourage the good man, I will pass all his sayings, and grant him those he cites were the true Reliques of the Saints, whose Bodies they were esteemed. Then he triumphs, and finds a Saint *John*, who hath two or three heads in the World, to have none in Heaven; and the Saints, who have left their bodies in Earth, to have none in Heaven. And, if I should say they were either replicated, or at least by
divers

divers *Ubications* in two places, he might easily rap me over the fingers, and tell me such solutions are fit for more Metaphysical Schools, that look *beyond* nature, and not for me, who ought to say no more then I can *understand*. Wherefore keeping my self to *Aristotle* and *Saint Thomas*, I must declare that the things we call *Reliques* are not the very Bodies of the Saints, but new Substances made out of the living bodies of such Saints, as much different substantially as if the bodies had been turned into ashes or grass, though morally keeping a respect to the Persons whereof they were made. Whence it follows, that in Heaven the Saints may have the same bodies they had upon Earth, though these Reliques remain in the Tombs. Peradventure this lesson will seem a hard one to him; But, let him study well how in *Aristotle* and *Saint Thomas's* way there is but one *materia prima*, or *pura potentia* under all forms, and how there is a compound made of this Matter and the Soul without any middle Entity to cement them together, & he may come to understand this mystery: the which I explicate no farther, because People for whom Books are printed in English, for the most part are not capable to reach and judge such points.

Devotion and Reason.

6. Here I should have made an end of troubling you with this Chapt. but that I found it necessary to put you in mind to reflect how in all this Chapter he hath sayd nothing to the purpose: Neither Scriptures, nor the Council any way touching the Controversy, but brought out to cover a silly Argument, which I expect will be often repeated over. But chiefly that the Fathers he cites are for the most part besides the game, speaking of what was done at our Saviour's resurrection, wherein we and he all agree very friendly, as far as concerns our present task; that is, that our Saviour set them all free that were then in Purgatory; but I say withall, that he bestow'd their Bodies on them, in which they should rise and accompany him to Heaven. The which I think he would not mislike, if it sprung in his own Garden: Now I know not how circumstances may blast it in his opinion.

SECOND

SECOND DIVISION.

Containing an Answer to the fifth Chapter.

Three Heresies club'd together to prove Ante-judiciary Delivery. Nothing evinc'd from the Testimonies of the Greek Fathers.

1. **I**N the fifth Chapter he gives very great words as if he would do wonders out of the Greek Fathers. To judge of the effect let us put some Notes, which I believe will be common to us both. The first is, that *Origen*, otherwise a great Doctor and Father, held how at the day of Judgment wicked men should begin to be punished; every one should be tormented by fire, some more, some shorter, according to the quantity of their crimes; but in fine, all at last set free, and received into Bliss. And, it is well known, that he had many followers; but at last was condemned, and it settled in the Church, that the damned were damned for all eternity.

2. My second Note is, that, though this Error of *Origen* was quelled in the Church, yet the Venome of it remained in the hearts of many under other words, and this question

stion, whether it be lawfull to pray for the damned. I say the malice of the former Error remained in this. For the Article of our Faith is, that the wicked deserve and have at death eternal damnation. Now, he that saith, that they may be pray'd for, says that by Prayers this sentence is revocable; and, by consequence, that whosoever is damned eternally it is for want of Prayers; and so evacuates the main Article of our Faith, engages all good men to have charity towards the damned, and wish to them the good which they are taught is possible, and makes the communion of the faithfull to reach into Hell. No wonder then, that St. Gregory the Great judged the opinion that Christ at his resurrection had freed some out of Hell to be Heretical; and would much more have condemned this opinion that it is lawfull to pray for damned souls; which gives every man, though he live and dye never so wickedly, hope of salvation; if he has but mony to get Masses enough.

3. My third Note is, that there was amongst the Ancient Christians an Heresy called of *Chiliasm* or *Millenaries*, which our *Fifth-Monarchy-men* pretend to resuscitate in *England*. They sayd, that there were two resurrections; the first of the Just, who
were

were to live and reign with Christ here upon Earth for a thousand years in all corporal prosperity before the generall resurrection. And there wanted not great, and otherwise Holy men, who were deluded into this opinion, by the apparency of some Texts of Scripture.

4. These be my Notes. Now the Conclusion, for which I drew them, is, to let you understand, that this great Divine makes a Gallimawfry of these three Heresies to present his unwary Reader with a dish of Purgatory; and, taking away these, and the speeches of some Fathers concerning the delivery of souls at Christs resurrection, his Chapter will be both very thin and lean, his testimonies few, and of no efficacy, if not contrary to his designe.

5. As for *Origenism*, he cites *Origen* himself, and Saint *Gregory Nyssen*, and would fain pull in *St. Basil* by the way of Brotherhood. As for the Errour it self, it hath two points in it, which makes it nothing to the Purpose; the first is, that whereas Purgatory ends amongst Catholicks at the day of Judgment, *Origen's* Purgatory begins then. So that *Origen's* Testimonies are very unskillfully apply'd to Purgatory. The second is, that this Divine ayming mainly to prove

Origen

prove, that a soul separated from the Body can receive change, can make no use of Origenism otherwise then to copen his auditory, seeing *Origen* puts the souls to have resum'd their Bodies before any change be made in them. As for the Person of *Origen*, it is so famous for this Errour, that our Divine cannot chuse but be asham'd to say he knew not this was his Errour. As for Saint *Gregory Nyssen*, it is a confessed thing both by Ancient and Modern Authours, that his works have been corrupted by the Origenists, and particularly the Book our Divine cites, as I perswade my self he had read in my answers to the Vindicatour and Refult; though it was not to his purpose to take notice that his Arguments were already answer'd. But I, for not being too troublesome to my Readers with repeating over the same things, must refer them to the second Part of *Religion and Reason*, Divis. 1: in the answer to the 22 th Section. Out of which it will clearly appear, that we are not to seek Saint *Basil's* opinion out of Saint *Gregory's*, which we cannot know perfectly, but rather Saint *Gregory's* out of Saint *Basil's*.

S^t. *Macarius*

6. His Testimonies from Authours of the second Heresy begin (as he would have it) from the great Saint *Macarius*, that is

to

to say, is father'd upon him, as this Divine cites it by *Rufinus Aquileiensis*; but it imports not by whom, for the story carries discredit enough in its own bowels, so that there is no need to look into the Authours credit. Yet something I have sayd to this in my *Notes* upon the first Chapter of the *Result*: So that here I have need onely to note that Gloss of Saint *Thomas* which he mentions, That the comfort which the damned Oracle speaks of, is no other then such Joy as the Devil hath when he makes men sin. Which signifies, that the damned souls are glad, that men sin in praying for them, which seems to be quite against the Intention of your Heretical citers of this story, and in a manner a rejection of the effect of it.

7. His next citation of this rank is out of the Oration of the Dead attributed to *St. John Damascen*, and is so shamefull an one, that I wonder any man, who esteems *St. John Damascen* for a grave Doctor, and one who holds not that the damned are to be prayed for, should attribute that Oration to him. For, besides that it is directly against Saint *John Damascen's* Doctrin, who teaches expresly that souls cannot be changed, what an unexcusable impudent assertion was it to say, that in his time both the whole East and

West

West did testify the delivery of *Trajan's* soul. Wherefore either this Writer lived after *Joannes Diaconus*, that is some 150 years after *St. John Damascen*, who could find no Testimony for this fable in the Latin Church of any weight, but that rather it was contradicted in *Rome* as against Scripture and Catholick faith, and had it out of him, or else he fained it by all probability. Neither did I ever hear of any authority for it in the Greek Church ancients then this Oration.

Theodora.

8. Another excellent History he hath of the Emperour *Theophilus*, exempted from *Hell* by the Prayers procured by the Empress his wife called *Theodora*. The substance of the History is, that this *Theophilus* was extremely wicked all his life time, embued in the blood of divers holy Martyrs; A little before his death he put a Gentleman to death upon false surmises, and taking his head by the hair in his hand, spake his last words. *Thou shalt be no more Theophobus* (that was the Gentlemans name) *nor I Theophilus*. So far publick Histories. After this he is reported to be stricken by God with a disease of gaping so wide, that men might look into his bowels (of which how unlikely it is, let Physicians consider.) In this case it

is reported he repented, but sure he was speechless, and by all likelihood could make but few certain signs. Howsoever, the story goes, he dy'd and was cast into Torments. But the Emprese making great multitude of prayers to be sayd for him, she had a Revelation of his delivery. This is the story; in which his wickedness is certain, his repentance surmis'd, his delivery known by Revelation. If you ask whence he was delivered, it is answered in *Basilid*, out of torments, properly such as are given to make one confess, that is, layd upon one by others, by which, and by the whole strain of the Authors, who generally speak of damned Persons, you may see it was not out of Griefs, such as the *Grecians* put in purgatory, that he was delivered, but from *Hell*. The Author of this story he cites *Triodius* and *Gennadius*, both admirers of the delivery of *Trajan*, as likewise the *Euchologium*, out of which he cites this prayer to God, that he, who deliver'd *Trajan* an infidel, should deliver N. N. a Christian.

9. But, to conclude the Testimonies of this quality, I must not forget two Authorities; the one out of the pretended Oration of *St. John Damascen*, the other from *Gennadius*. They both tend to the same purpose, that the

St. John
Damascen

the stories concerning these things which are in the Lives of Saints, and Divine Revelations, are not to be counted. Of which proposition, I pray take speciall notice, that you may see the truth of my proposition, *that the Greeks have as many stories of relieving the damned, as we have of the delivery of the souls in Purgatory.* Now, Sir, I pray if you can have that freedome, by friends cause it to be ask'd of the Authour, whether he thinks the opinion of delivering and relieving the *damned* to be true, and I think he will say *no*. Then let him be pressed, whether these stories be true, or false: It must necessarily follow they are false in his Judgment. Here I would intreat to know what greater certitude there is in our Revelations then in the Grecian ones, or why it is more unlawfull for me to give little credit to ours, than it is for him to refuse the *Greeks*. And so hitherto I believe I may safely say, I have heard nothing, by which I may understand the Greek Church holds the antejudiciary releasing of souls out of Purgatory, the two questions being very divers, of an ordinary releasing out of Purgatory, and an extraordinary releasing out of Hell.

Jews, Turke, 10. Though my case be very hard, yet I
etc must

must not conceal it, that I am condemn'd by Pagans, Jews, Mahometans, and at last the Ethiopian Church. And as for the Jews, I cannot deny it, but they hold a true Jew can be but a year in pains for his sins, and therefore I must be lyable to have erred against the *Thalmud*. The *Alcoran* is known to have taken divers points from the Jews, though the Turks are sayd to wear a tuft of hair, by which Mahomet must catch them to carry them to Paradise, when he comes to fetch them, which now, they cannot tell when it will be, seeing the eight hundred years are passed, which he prefixed. *Zagazabo's* Ethiopical faith, that in Purgatory there are kept Saturday, and Sunday Holidayes every week, whence it hath any ground, I can no more guess, then I can, how *Plato*, whom he also cites, got such fine stories of the other world. Wherefore helping out his account by *Aeneas* his returning from Hell thorough the Ivory Gates of *Hensay*, and remembering his prayer to the same purpose;

*Si Fratrem Pollux alternâ morte redemit,
Itque reditque viam toties, &c.*

I end this rank of his Testimonies, Noting
onely, that his inconsequent descent upon the

C

Council

Council of Florence, p. 76. was prevented by me in *Religion and Reason*, p. 60. Though he thinks it the safest way not to take notice of my former Replies, when they disable any Testimonies, which he conceives bear some shew of weight, and Authority.

11. Besides these his Arch-Patrons, he hath some by-helps, which I must examin. I find them of two kinds, some express that at that very time, in which Prayers are sayd for the dead, the dead feel some relief. For this his chief Testimony is from the story of the Idolatrous skull, whose words he cites to be. *At what hour you make commemoration of those, and pray for them, who are in pain, they feel some comfort.* And I cannot deny but the Doctrin agrees very well both with the Devil who spake it, and the Pulpit, out of which he preach'd.

St. John: Alms =
next.

12. His next Authority is out of one *Leontius*, an holy Bishop, who wrote the life of *St. John the Almoner*, a man who spent great Alms upon all sorts of poor, and specially upon those who were plundered by the *Persians*, who in those times took the Holy Land, and amongst other Captives, one a *Cypriot*, who having been prayed for by his friends as a dead man, was thrice in a year set free from his bands (but not from his Prison).

Prison) for one dayes space, and found fast the next day. And it is added, that the Holy Bishop St. *John* relating this story was used to say, *From hence we learn, that the dead have then rest when we make Collects for them.* This is the story, and for the authenticalness of it, this Divine mentions how this work of *Leontius* was attested in the second Council of *Nice*. But he does not tell us, that the authentical copy of this book is not extant, but onely a Paraphrasis of it made by *Metaphrastes*, of whom good Authours have that opinion, that he added many things of his own, and that he wrote Saints lives, not as they truly passed, but as they might have passed; and this Judgment is not of him onely in common, but particularly of this life of St. *John*. And concerning this very story, you may note two things, The one, that he tells the story to have passed in *Cyprus*; whereas St. *John* lived in *Alexandria*; Secondly, that, whereas other stories of the same nature in Pope *Gregory*, and Venerable *Bede*, make the Bands remain loose, this story makes them to be supernaturally bound again, which seems to be against the nature of Gods gifts, which are given *without repentance*, but much favours the Doctrin of Relief in Hell. Wherefore it is vehemently

to be suspected, that those words *then* and *when* come from his Paraphrase, and that the Saint's words reached no farther then what we read in others, that this story argued that prayers relieved the dead; As truly no more can be gather'd out of such Histories, which are Parabolical; and it were very absurd to parallel small circumstances betwixt corporeal Allegories, & spiritual things signify'd by them. Howsoever the Authority can be no greater then of *Metaphrastes*, who is held in a Rhetorical way to fain many things; and it is to be noted, that he lived after *Gregory* the Third's days, and peradventure after the time of the Oration *De dormientibus* was written.

St. Denys, C. St.
Athanasius.

13. Being freed from these sleight stories, we may see what Testimonies of solid Fathers he brings for his opinion. He cites St. *Denys*, but never a word, which brings the Testimony home to our Controversy, he speaking but in common of the remission of the sin. His second Authour is St. *Athanasius*. The words, that *The souls of sinners feel some benefit when good works and offerings are performed for them*. This Testimony has three faults. First the Authour is not St. *Athanasius*, as is so manifest by the work it self; that it is a gross mistake to cite it as his, though

though this Divine be not the first who objected it to me; and farther it is clear, the Authour wrote since the Turks were Masters of *Græce*, by the phrase of calling the Romans *French-men*. His second fault is, that he distinguishes not *dead*, but pronounces of *all* dead mens souls: which argues the opinion of those, who hold relief in *Hell*. Thirdly, these words, *When good works, &c.* are equivocal, and may be as well interpreted, that good works are the *causes* of relief; as they do the *time*, unless other words force them to be taken emphatically, which do not appear here. St. *Ephrem* is also cited, but not in what work, nor of what certainty, for his works are very ambiguous. Besides, that he is cited out of another Authour named *Severus Alexandrinus*, who, what he was I know not; One I read of, but an Arch-heretick. The Testimony it self smells of the intervalls, which the comforters of *Hell* invent; and the works attributed to St. *Ephrem* are so uncertain, that no guess can be made of what value this Authority is.

14. The Testimonies he cites out of St. *Epiphanius*, and St. *Chrysostom* are more certain, but they favour my opinion, not his. For to *help*, and *not cancel*, the sin, and that

St. Chrys:

some comfort accrues to the dead by the sacrifice of the Mass, are the very expressions, which we use. But the other words, to wit, that it may happen that a total pardon may be obtained for them by our prayers, comes out of a false Translation. The true Translation is, that it is possible to gather pardon from all sides by prayer, that is, that abundance of prayers may be gotten either from all sorts of persons; or all sorts of actions towards getting of pardon: for *St. Chrysostom* makes mention of both. And these words *περιδοῦν* and *συναγαγεῖν*, signifies motion from the circumference to the centre. His last place of *St. Chrys.* out of the 21 Homily upon the Acts, I must tell him if he had not another Text then I, he hath much abused the good Saint. The words as I read them are, *est enim, si voluerimus, leve ipsi supplicium facere.* If we will, it is possible to make his punishment light. Which he translates *lighter*, to which he adds as his own descant to make out the Testimony, *then it was at first.* Much from the Saints mind, who, though he be earnest to perswade to prayers and good works, yet never descends to more particulars then that they will do *some good*, or else that the Living shall get good by them; *nobis Deus placatur erit*, which *St. Austin* also glances

ces at, to wit, when the soul is damned. Now if the torment of the dead be *sooner* ended, your Divine will not doubt, but that it is *lighter*.

St. Greg. Naz.

15. But I must not forget his citation of St. *Greg. Nazianzen*, of which he seems to make great esteem, and it is least of all to the purpose. For, as it is true St. *Gregory* speaks of a Purging before Resurrection, so is it clearly to be understood of that, which is made by death, as is evident by that expression, *either purged or lay'd aside*, For nothing can be understood to be *layd aside*, but the *body*, and what is layd aside with it. So that all his expression is of the effect of death, and nothing touching what is to be done in the pure spirit. And so I am quit of this troublesome Chapter, without any mention of delivering souls out of Purgatory in the Greek Fathers.

Grecks.

16. As for the Greek Church he brings me a Letter from some Town, wherein there lived many Catholick and Learned Grecians, from whom his friend received this Character, that all the Grecian Catholick Church approves, and admits priviledged Altars and Indulgences for the souls in Purgatory, the which they believe go streight to Heaven as soon as they have satisfied. And I am so far

from discrediting this Letter, as that I sincerely believe it, and yet think what I sayd to be true. For this word *Catholick Greek Church* is not exempt from the Law of other words, to wit, that it may be understood in divers senses by divers speakers; so that if this City he speaks of signifies either *Rome*, or *Venice*, which are the likeliest Cities of Christendome to have Grecians of that quality living in them, and the Greeks in those two Cities communicate with none but such as either live under Latin Governours, and so do easily follow their customs, or otherwise are instructed by such Missionaries as go from the Greek Colledg in *Rome*, I do not wonder, that they should answer that the Catholick Grecians hold Indulgences, as they do in *Italy*: Nay, peradventure may think the rest no Catholicks even upon this score. But, when I spake of the Greek Church, I spake of the descendents from the Greeks, which made the Union in the Council of *Florence*, without receiving any new Doctrin since.

THIRD DIVISION,

Containing an Answer to his sixth Chapter.

Testimonies from Latin Fathers before St. Austin, either favouring of Millenarism, or opposit to the Alledger, or (not found, but) fram'd to his purpose by Additions of his own; and, lastly, his onely expresse Testimony, uncertain.

1. **I**N the sixth Chapter he pretends to shew that the Latin Church before St. Austin held the delivery of souls out of Purgatory before the day of Judgment. His two first Testimonies, according to the custom of those whose chief end is to make a shew, hang in the position which is common to both sides, being but pure prayers that deceased souls should go to Heaven, without specifying *when*. But because his devotion was so hot, that it could not expect God's pleasure and determination, he would have us believe it was meant *presently*.

2. His next two Testimonies are drawn from the Heresy of the *Millenaries*, praying

first resurrection

to God, that the soul may rise in *the first resurrection*. For the former Testimony being *Tertullians*, of whom it is known that he was of that Sect, and the words being proper to that Sect, it cannot be doubted of his meaning. The second Testimony is from the Gothick Liturgy, the which of what authority it is I know not. We well know the *Goths* were *Arrians* for the most part of their Flourish in *Italy*, and a great while in *Spain*; we know that this Millenary Errour was greatly dispersed even amongst Catholicks, but more amongst Hereticks, who have not the rule of Unity and Tradition, which keep Catholicks from easy changing. The words of the prayer are the proper words of the *Millenarians*. The glosses he seeks to make, as they may be good to the Text of the Apocalyps; so is their sence too far fetcht to be the sence of a prayer for common People. Wherefore either it is a pure piece of *Millenarism*, or at least he must first vindicate it from being so, before it can serve him for a Testimony. Now the *Chilists* Errour was, that Christ was to reign upon Earth corporally with his Saints for a thousand years *before the general resurrection*, then to give the hundredfold of what his Saints had forsaken for his sake in this world,

accor-

according to his promise in the Gospel. But, because this was a *corporal* resurrection, therefore, though there had been no Heresy in the position, it could serve your Divine to no purpose. Now it serves onely to shew how short his performance falls from his bragging promises.

3. His next authority comes truly after *St. Austins* time, being a story out of *St. Gregory of Tours* contemporary to the Great, yet because it is of *St. Martin* it must speak for *St. Martin's* age. The story, as he relates it, is of a Holy Virgin, to whom *St. Martin* after her death procured bliss. His first Note is, that Saints, whose Sepulchers are visited for Saints Sepulchers, may yet stay some while in purgatory: I easily grant him that, without the Authority of this story. For the fallibility of Peoples Judgments in such things is very well known. And I should not boggle at it, though it were untill the day of Judgment. His second Note is, that *St. Martin* in the primitive Church believed as we do. But for this, I know not that the name of the *Primitive Church* reaches after *Constantin's* time, and *St. Martin* was but a young man in *Julian's* time, when, being but a Catechumen, he gave half his Cloak to our Saviour. Farther to think he believ'd as we do,

5th Copy

do is a hard matter. For I must first believe the story to be true, which may be doubted, since *St. Gregory* gives testimony of it onely as a report he had heard from some old men, who lived where this Tombe was, and none of them could have had been witness of the fact, which was passed 150 years before. So that it has no better Authority then of a Country tale. Nor does *St. Gregory's* Vote (which is his third Note) much mend it, as he may easily see, if he reads *Baronius* his Opinion of *St. Gregory's* History, *T. 2. An. 109. Sect. 49.* And in the true History (which he sets down but by halves) there are divers inconvenient circumstances. One he makes mention of, to wit, that the Holy Maid was kept from Heaven by reason of a no-very great fault; but in the History you cannot perceive there was any fault at all. His fourth Note is, that *St. Gregory* the great was not the first, that began to write such stories: but *St. Gregory* of *Tours* before him. Those that will be accurate say seventeen yeares before him, if that, in such a question as this is not to be together. But truly I believe it was one hundred at least. For the Pope *Gregory* tells so many of like stories, that a popular Errour can hardly be thought to grow so fast, as that the first should have been

been, but seventeen years before it could grow so common.

2. Then he comes to St. Hierom, out of whom he recounts what words a soul delivered out of Purgatory may say. And if you ask what this is to the purpose, he answers by adding to the words of St. Hierom, that the soul speaks this before the resumption of her body, and proves it; because the Saint passing to other things saith, they shall be done in the consummation of the world. Is not this goodly stuff for a Divine to fill a Book withall?

3. Next in rank is brought in St. Ambrose with the Elogy of the Father in Christ to St. Austin. Out of him he cites two places. The first out of the Preparatories to Mass assign'd for Friday. His words, to intreat that *the Mass may this very day* (in great Letters) *be a great and full banquet of thee (Jesus Christ) the living Bread, which came from Heaven.* I would he had taken the pains to apply his Text to our question: for I find a great difficulty. Yet I think I can find two pretty good constructions. The one is to understand it objectively, the other efficiently: For the proposition being, that *the Mass should be this banquet*, either it must be meant, that the dead should rejoyce of

St. Hierom

St. Ambrose

of his saying of Mass by way of the devotion; that is used to be called, *communicating spiri-
tually*, or else that the Mass should be *cause* of
their seeing of God. Whether way soever it
be taken, the effect of the prayer is, that he
may this day say Mass with that Charity and
Devotion, as that it may be profitable to the
souls of the dead. But both these may be
done without any change in the souls. For if
his Mass prove so good, the souls knew of it;
at their first going out of the body, and were
to have the effect of it in its due time, meer-
ly by the position of the Action this very
day, without any great Letters. But to un-
derstand it as it must be understood to serve
for his purpose, that *this very day the souls
should receive bliss*; was a very uncivil re-
quest, to expect Purgatory should be em-
ptied for the saying of one Mass; and surely
takes away all excuse from the Pope, why
he likewise doth not give such Indulgences as
at least once in the year to make a Goal-
delivery of Purgatory, that Christians might
have as much priviledge as the Jews to lye
but one twelve month in that place. But
specially this request befitted not *St. Ambrose*;
whom we shall have our Divine bring in
promising to pray longer for one soul, then
one Mass comes to.

4. By occasion of the great Letters of *This very day* our Divine remembred there wanted great Letters in a former citation of the commendation of the soul, and therefore repeats it adding great Letters that the soul might shew a patent to go out of Purgatory that day. But he had forgot, that the soul which is there pray'd for is taken to be not yet in Purgatory; nor to have received her judgment. And if he look into the Fathers, and see how hopefully they speak of dying Christians, he will not wonder at such prayers.

5. Into which Doctrin if he had looked he would not have been so confident of his next citation out of St. *Ambrose*, as if St. *Ambrose* had intended to starve himself in Prayer for the delivery of *Theodosius* his soul. For he may find that St. *Ambrose* thought *Theodosius* to be in Heaven when he pronounced the words he cites. Wherefore if the answer I gave to this Testimony in my *Notes* on the fourth Chapter of the *Results* does not please him, let him distinguish the two goods that belong to the soul, the one beginning at death, the other at the day of Judgment, and take notice, that he that has the one may be prayed for to come to the other, as St. *Austin* seems to do for *Verecundus*.

St. *Ambrose*
for *Theodosius*.

dus,

das. So then these words he cites belongs to the good to be received by Judgment, as likewise those in the same Oration; *Da requiem perfectam seruo tuo Theodosio, requiem illam quam prapastisti Sanctis tuis.* And let these others, *Regnum mutavit, non deposuit; in tabernacula Christi; jure pietatis ascitus in illam Hierusalem supernam, &c.* And again, *Manet ergo in lumine Theodosius, & sanctorum catibus gloriatur;* And again; *Nunc se angusta memoria Theodosius regnare cognosci, quando in regno Domini fesu est.* Let these, and such others explicate that he was not in Purgatory, or Torment, of which there is no mention, nor of delivering him from them; but not as yet corporally in Heaven, whither nevertheless St. *Ambrose* expected his prayers should bring him: So that nothing can be more direct and plain for my opinion; then this Oration of St. *Ambrose.*

St. *Paulinus.*

6. His last witness is St. *Paulinus*, who could not speak home enough, and therefore our Divine teacheth him his duty, that he should not pray onely, that the dew of Grace should refrigerate the souls which lay scorched in burning darkness, as the Saint spoke; but that this change should be presently made, for else it is nothing to his purpose.

7. And

7. And thus have we got through his sixth Chapter, where there is nothing more for this purpose; then that there was an uncertain tale of St. *Martin* told in St. *Gregory* of *Tours* his days, and unwarily accepted of by him. St. *Ambrose* notoriously for my side, and the rest common for both sides, and inched out by our Divines devices.

FOURTH DIVISION.

Containing an Answer to his sixth Chapter.

Pretended Testimonies for St. Austin's opinion, partly abusing that Father, making himself contradicting and blasphemous, partly inefficacious without the Adversaries assistance, opposite to the Tenets they are brought for, or utterly unauthentick. The great rarity of Mr. J. M's. unanswerable demonstration, coming off very unfortunately.

I. **H**IS seventh Chapter is wholly spent about St. *Austin*, to make him for the present delivery, or at least refreshment of souls in Purgatory. A hard task, but truly he behaves himself manfully in it. For

He likes not to give St. *Austin* the ly to his
 tooth, and tell him and us that he sayd what
 St. *Austin* in plain terms sayes he knows not.
 Two places then he draws out of St. *Austin*
 in the front, which the rest must second. The
 former is in the Chapter 109. of his *Enchiridion*. His words, *The time, that is plac'd*
between the death of man, and his last resur-
rection contains souls in hidden receptacles,
according as each one of them is worthy either
of rest or of misery as she has made her for-
tune when she lived in her flesh. And after
 some words of his own, he adds And of these
 souls he sayth, *It is not to be deny'd, that*
then when the Sacrifice of our Mēdiatour is
offer'd for them, they are eas'd. He adds the
 Latin words, *Relaxantur compedibus offertur.*
 He tells us further that the Conclusion of
 the Chapter is, that to whomsoever they
 (prayers) are available, they avail to make
 the forgiveness compleat, or at least to make
 the pain it self more tolerable. This is the main
 place, for the second is but as it were a re-
 peating of the last words of this in his Book
 of eight Questions to *Dulcissimū*. So that it
 is a confirmation, that St. *Austin* spoke the
 first words not slightly, but upon a constant
 resolution.

3. He

2. He adds divers caveats to make his argument sure, and some replies upon answers which I shall not give him. The which therefore I shall partly omit, partly touch as far as they shall open the question. For the present I onely ask whether if any man being ask'd whether Mr. J. M. were gone to London, should answer, truly I do not know, but if he be gone to London, I am sure he went by *Dunstable*, for there is no other way, whether I say, that man could take it well at one's hands, who would take his oath he had said Mr. J. M. was gone to London by *Dunstable*, and justify it to his face. Now my Answer is, that Mr. J. M. doth so to St. *Austin*. He brings two places, in which he tells St. *Austin* he says souls are *relaxed*, or *refreshed in Purgatory*: And St. *Austin* in the very same Books in precedent Chapters, expressly professes he doth not know whether there be any such purgation, or no. The one place is in the 19 Chapter of the *Enchiridion* he cites, whereas his Chapter is the 109th. The second is in the resolution of the first question to *Dulcius*, whereas his is in the second question: The words are these in his own Translation, about the end of this Chapter, *It is not incredible also that some such thing may be after this life; And*

whether it be so or no, it may be examined; and either be discovered, or continue hidden; to wit, that some of the faithfull are by a certain Purgatory fire, so much sooner or later saved, by how much more or less they see their affections upon transitory goods. And the same words has he in his *Enchiridion*, out of the which he repeats them in this. I might take notice, that St. *Austin's* word being *quæri potest*, it may be inquired, or sought for, which signifies that as yet it had not been look'd into; he interprets it *examined*, as if it had been doubted of. Secondly, that whereas St. *Austin* expresseth the question to be, whether some faithfull people be sooner or later saved, by his own Translation, and therefore this was that which might be found or not found out, your Gentleman will draw that St. *Austin* sayes that it cannot be proved that their opinion is false, but only that it may be hidden. And I cannot deny but that his Cavil is cunning. But I pray when the question is of *being*, or *not being*, cannot the solution be either that it is, or is not, and if the question be not solved (which is, *the solution to be hidden*) are not both parts hidden, and not only one? so that this answer is expressly against the Text.

3. His other solution is no less either against the Text, or unreasonable, for indeed it is a meer puzzle, and not an answer. For what matter is it whether the object be lawfull or unlawfull, if this be confessed that the affection is sinfull? Therefore it is not to be doubted but the question is, whether sins in Purgatory be shorter and longer punished, according to their gravity? For, let him look whether St. *Austin* speaking of the punishment in this life, puts it for any thing but *sin*. Wherefore, if *Bellarmin* had no better solution, it was not worth the looking for, and he rather disgrac'd the Catholick cause then helped it by so poor a discourse. Therefore I can conclude no otherwise then that your Divine gives St. *Austin* fairly the ly to his face, seeing that where he professes expressly he *does not know*, not that it had as yet been brought in question whether in Purgatory some souls were purg'd sooner then others. This Divine tells him he *does know*, and brings his words to make him eat them. But what are these words of St. *Austin*. It is true he sayth, *The souls are helped by prayers*, which is the position common to us both. But *when when* is your Divines liberality, whom I find light finger'd enough in his Translations.

4. St. *Austin* adds that to whom prayers are available, *aut ad hoc profunt ut sit plena remissio, vel aut certe tolerabilior fiat ipsa damnatio.* Your Divine explicates it, that in Purgatory, either all the pain, or some part be remitted. But reading St. *Austin* makes me think that he speaks of Purgatory and Hell. For he speaks in common of the dead, & descends particularly both to the damned and those in Purgatory; and of the Damned he pronounces that, *Et si nulla sunt adiumenta mortuorum, qualescunque uisum con-solationes sunt.* As who should say their damnation is less, because it is good to their living friends, according to the prayer of the rich glutton in Hell, who would not have his Brothers come to him, which if it be the true meaning he will put that all prayers for those in Purgatory obtain full remission, to wit, when the time comes. And though it be clear, that seeing these words can be spoken no otherwise then upon supposition of a truth which he expresses to be *unknown* to him in the same Book (and in the one hath these words, *Sive ergo in hac tantum vita ista homines patiuntur, sive etiam post hanc vitam alia quaedam iudicia subsequuntur, non abhorret, &c.*) they truly signify nothing to our Controversy, yet let them be taken in all the rigour

rigour the words can bear, they say nothing
against our opinion. For both *full remission*
in vertue of the prayers may belong to
the day of Judgment, and the *more tolerable-
ness* of the pains argues, not that the pains
are lessened after the beginning, nor that
they receive end before the day of Judge-
ment. For God being the imposer of the
pain in their way, and all things being
present to him, he can, when he list, that is,
at the first instant, proportion the pains
as well to prayers as to sins, and set
such a pain to endure to the day of Judge-
ment, that the merit of prayer may have its
value notwithstanding the equality of the
duration: This I speak in your Divines man-
ner of discourse, so that you may see that
this conclusion may stand with their appre-
hensions of Purgatory, so Revelations were
set on side.

5. Out of the explication of this place,
all other places out of St. *Austin* are plain
though indeed even without this place they
have no difficulty. For who doubts but that
the dead are *helped* by prayers, and if *helped*,
dealt more mercifully withall? or that this
is come to us by Tradition? Likewise there
is no question whether these torments begin
before the day of Judgment, or at the very

hour of our death, but whether they are before that day. Nor likewise do we question whether they be purged *after* resurrection. For our position is, that Resurrection is the end of their torments. But these I easily pardon him, for I easily apprehend he understood not fully my opinion. Wherefore to talk to him in his own Language, let him compare an *Instant Angelicum* to the time it dures for example sake some grief, that in a soul would be purging to the time which runs parallel to it, and see whether it will not be a purging in every instant of time, and yet will have purged nothing untill the Resurrection, which we put to be the ending of the pains of Purgatory: by which you will understand how far he looks awry, to say we put no purging *before* the day of Judgment, but all *at* or *after* it.

6. Yet were he content to abuse St. *Austin* in a small matter, we had reason to have patience. His insolency grows so high as to condemn him of no less then Blasphemy. Read in his fifth Number. After he hath told us that St. *Austin* speaks of spirits being purg'd before they receive their bodies, not distinguishing betwixt *Purging*, and *being purged*, which later St. *Austin* speaks not of, He adds to make it more evident that he speaks

speaks of a purgation wholly ended and dispatched, before any one resume their body. And tells that St. *Austin* moves the question, if any dye so immediately before the day of Judgment, that there is not time enough for prayers to be said for them, what shall become of them; And St. *Austin's* resolution he doth not let us know, but he presses that St. *Austin* requires time that they may be cleansed before the day of Judgment. To which is answered, I see well that the objection seems to do so, but why the objection St. *Austin* makes should be taken for his Doctrine, I do not know. And if I were to answer the question, I should doubt whether the great Persecution of Antichrist's times, and the wonders of the dying world, can stand with that tepidity, which carries men to Purgatory. But what sayes your great Divine? He tells us St. *Austin* stands in doubt whether a man who dyed then in the state of being to be purged, should not be damned if there wanted time to purge him. That is, that St. *Austin* is of mind that a Venial sin becomes a mortal one by an extrinsecal accident, that changeth nothing in the soul. Can you take this man either to be a solid Divine, or to bear any respect to St. *Austin*, that sticks not to impose such an abominable

Errour

Errour and Blasphemy upon him? As to say, that God is so cruel as to punish a man eternally, who loves him as his last end, and otherwise deserves it not meere for want of time to punish him: St. *Austin* would perswade himself that God would rather keep off the day of Judgment, and let all the world stay for their resurrection, so abominable a Blasphemy he would take it to be.

7. In his seventh N. he tells us news of an *unanswerable demonstration* against us: but because it belongs not to St. *Austin*, I shall let it alone untill he comes to his Reason. Another Authority then he brings out of this, that St. *Austin* praying for his Mother, sayes, that he doubts not but that God had granted his request. So your faithfull interpreter translates these words, *Credo jam feceris quod te rogo*, I believe thou hast done already what I ask thee: which is no more then that he believed his Mother was already in Bliss, to wit, from the first hour she dy'd; but that she had gotten it by his prayers not a word, if not expressly contrary; for he expresses that his prayer was after the dead.

8. The next Text I know not whether he means to bring it for himself, or for me, but surely it speaks for me; that is so expressly

pressly of the day of Judgment, that there is no comparison. The fire which the Apostle testifies to go before Christ's coming to Judgment, being the chief subject of the place, and himself confessing the literal sense of the Prophecy to be so, but that St. Austin (to do him a pleasure) might apply it to Purgatory. Nay, that St. Eucherius does plainly, which put together makes this Conclusion; that Purgatory is terminated with the last Judgment, as my position holds forth. His last Testimony is out of the Sermons, *ad Fratres in Eremito*, the which he says have crept into the times of St. Austin. But whence? Baronius answers you, calling the Author of them *Impostorem & fictorem frigidum, qui multa destra, vana, fabulosa effudit, & portentosa mendacia blaterat.*

FOURTH

FIFTH DIVISION

Containing an Answer to the eighth and ninth Chapter.

Testimonies from St. Austin to Bede, either unsound in Faith or Divinity. St. Gregory's mis-translated and maimed. Canus his Rule opposit to the Alleggers intencion, Venerable Bede not engag'd in our Controversy. The first Allegation from him misinterpreted. Drithelmus his Revelation opposit to the Church's Doctrin.

IN HIS eighth Chapter contains the Authours betwixt St. Austin and Bede. The which to make the fuller, he divides one Authour into Eusebius Emisenus, and Eucherius Lugdunensis; and, if I am not mistaken, it is the same, whom before he cited for St. Austin. The words be afore answered, and the answer is, that they deliver directly my opinion, seeing they mention both the fire of Judgment, and the Condition of Purgatory, that the last farthing must be pay'd in it.

2. After

2. After this Trinity and Unity, he brings in two Fathers; whose works I cannot yet get to see, St. *Isidore*, and St. *Pasius* of *Pollado*; Their Testimonies both seem to be derived from St. *Austin*, but with their own explications or additions, which I must desire your Divine to make consonant to the Doctrin of the Catholick Church before I accept of them; Otherwise I must think the Text some ways corrupted. Peradventure when I see the Texts, some solution may appear. In the mean while he makes *Isidore* tell us, that *suffrages* profit the dead, not to any merit of eternal life, but *ad solatium pena*; which he interprets the payment of their pains; And I, the releasing, or dissolving of their pains. And I think more properly. For *suffrages* are Votes or Intercessions, and belong to *Impetration*, not to *Bargaining*: Which as far as I have heard, was not thought of in those days. But this by the way: My difficulty is, how seeing we see all the prayers for the dead to be supplications to bring them to Heaven, and enjoying of God, it can be deny'd that these *suffrages* of the Saints profit the dead towards the gaining of Heaven, and merit of eternal life. Surely he must say one thing is pray'd for, and another thing given. I doubt if I get the Book I shall find

find some other dash of a cunning Painter in this citation, yet take it as it lyes as far as concerns our question: the same solution we gave to St. *Austin's* words, how the pain is mitigated or released, serves for the meaning of this Saint, who seems clearly by the very words to have drawn it out of St. *Austin*.

3. St. *Julian's* Testimony also as far as he adds to St. *Austin's* words contain this Doctrine. That the torment of fire in Purgatory is equal to all souls, and onely different in duration. He gives us the words thus, *What is performed in those who are reprobate by distinction of their torments* (into sharper or milder, is his comment) *that is performed by the measure of time in those who are saved by fire. For to them lesser or greater punishment of Purgatory fire shall be so much the more extended (according to the measure of time, adds your Divine) by how much they have here more or less lov'd temporal goods.* So that the addition this Father maketh to St. *Austin* is that the Variety of Purgatory pains rises purely out of the measure of time. The which Doctrine I have not heard of either before this Saint or after. And yet I cannot but confess it is a Doctrine necessary to the maintenance of this

this opinion, that souls are released from Purgatory, some sooner, some later. For, putting that the pains of Purgatory are some more grievous then others, that variety would take away all just occasion of ones being deliver'd before another, for the lessening of pain would recompense the length of time in him that is longer there for lesser faults, and leave the proportion of justice still constant in both. Now, as it is not impossible this Holy Father might hold this Doctrine, though I believe your Divine if he should speak his conscience, would say he thought it false, so why your Divine should be so stiff upon one half of the proposition, and refuse the other, let himself answer, specially one depending upon the other, and having no ground but upon the other, which it self hath no ground at all.

4. We are come to his ninth Chapter, and the Visionarie Ages. And first he brings in St. Gregory the Great, and he accuses me that unskillfully and injuriously I make this our Apostle and Father in Christ to be Father of their opinion. And I cannot deny but I was in the wrong and lyable to his blame: But I hope I have given him satisfaction in part in my answer to the Vindicatour, which by all circumstances he could not refuse.

chuse but have heard of before the printing
 his Book, yet pleased not to take notice of
 He may find it in pag. 77 and repeated in my
 Notes upon the Result, pag. 22, 23, 70, 71,
 72. So that, supposing my confession will de-
 serve his absolution, I confess my fault to have
 lay'd that Book so flatly to St. Gregory's
 charge, whereas I find now some reasons to
 doubt of it. But yet I cannot deny but that the
 Author of that Book was the main Origin
 and supporter of the opinion. Nor doth his
 opposition remove me from believing the
 Author, who telleth it me with his own
 mouth. Your Divine himself cites the words,
 but not without the mystery of a Transla-
 tion. For the Popes words in the Person of
 his Deacon are, *why in these Testimonies* (by
 the answer I conceive he means towards the
 end of the World) *so many things concerning*
souls; (which of course) become clear, which be-
fore lay hidden: In so much that the world to
come seems to open and press it self upon us
by plain Revelations and Manifestations. Your
 Divine instead of *do grow clear*, which signi-
 fies the present time, puts *were discovered*.
 For which before were hidden, he translates,
had remained undiscovered, as if they were
 not things, which needed Revelation, but on-
 ly Discovery. The last words by which it's
 manifest

times
 +

manifest that the discovery is made by Revelations and not by our endeavours, he quite leaves out. He fairly grants that the Pope acknowledges the case of the question to be true; And gives the answer, to wit, that the nearer this world draws to the next, the state of the next is by more signs made manifest, as the latter part of the night partakes of the dawning of the day. I wonder if the question were divided, and first asked, did this knowledg begin in this Age? What could be more plainly answer'd then, in these latest or ending times. If it were ask'd, was the Doctrin delivered before? what more plain then *Ante latuerunt, they were before unknown*. If it were ask'd by what means do they now come to be known? what more plain then, by plain Revelations and Manifestations or Apparitions. I wonder where is the sincerity I saw, or thought I saw in this man at my first acquaintance with him that he should bring so manifest and plain an assertion into question? I fear a new Divinity hath taught him also new Morality.

5. For his own defence he objects that St. Gregory in the former Chapters, for nine Chapters together had recounted *strange things of souls*, wherefore it may be the Author meant of them. Not will I deny that,

but, seeing the story is the occasion of the question, and immediately advances and brings it in, there is no probability this should be none of those he speaks of. I should be tedious to my Reader to press a thing so clear beyond *enough*. Therefore I will only note how unlikely this Testimony and the alladging of it is to the practice of Magdeburgians, by which he would obscure it. For here is expressly held forth; *Now it begins, it was unknown before Revelations, and, the pressing upon us of the next world, not old Tradition, doth manifest these things, of which kind if the Magdeburgians would bring proof, this Divine would find a hard task to maintain the contrary.*

6. He makes mention of the Judgment of *Canus* concerning these stories of Pope Gregory, and venerable Bede, and expresses it, that the *Nicety* of this Age will not credit them; so he translates *Aristarchi*, which word signifies the grave *Censurers* or good Divines, to whom Censuring belongs. And truly I do not doubt but if such stories were written now, they would be forbidden as some have been: For indeed they undermine Christian Divinity, by introducing vagabond Purgatories, Circumstances not according to the Rule of faith to be required

to Salvation; and scarcely can you find a story of any length, but it hath a smack of somekind of superstition in it. He adds a Rule of *Canus* to distinguish Histories as to their truth; to wit, to see whether the Authour relates what himself saw or had from those who saw it. In which kind of stories he says it is an heynous offence, to suspect that approved Doctors will recommend a ly to eternal memory.

7. This Rule being settled, he produces the story of the simoniacal Monk, whom his Abbot, Authour of the story, caused after 30 dayes Purgatory to be redeemed by thirty Masses. Well then, according to our Rule let us not deny any thing that the Authour saw or had from those who saw it. We must confess then, that the Monk was *simoniacal*; His fellow Monks forbidden to assist at his death; His body with the mony buried without Christian Ceremonies, No prayers for him for a whole month, and Mass for the second month. All this was seen, and therefore we should wrong the Authour, and offend against *Canus* his Rule if we deny'd any of this. After this follows how after thirty days the Monk appeared to his Brother (who as I remember was an *Apothecary*, and the Apparition in his Sleep) telling

him hitherto I have been in bad case; but now I am well; For this day I have received the Communion, which (says your Divine) I understand to be the full effect of the Communion of the Saints. I pray, Sir, do you think Pope Gregory, or Copiosus who had the Vision were eye-witnesses of this gloss? and yet the verity of the History depends chiefly and mainly upon it. For, if it be not true, there is somewhat that stands not well with ordinary Divinity, and so the whole History the which subsists upon Copiosus's, whether you call it *vision* or *dream*, will fall to the ground. Now I see the forbidding of his fellow Monks to assist the Simoniacal Person at his death, and the burying of him unchristianly, was a kind of Excommunication to him; and this without question we are to think he alluded to whatsoever the dark meaning of the word be, which seems rather to be a fancy that run in Copiosus's head, out of what he had seen done to his Brother, then to bear any perfect sense with it.

8. Your Divine here hath another pretty invention, which if he can prove, I shall submit to all he saith of Purgatory. He lays it forth in these words. *Lastly, some are so ignorant in Antiquity, as to account it an exotic kind of Excommunication which is extended*

to Purgatory. And I confess my self one of those. Yet, he must not bring instances to me, how dying or dead men were excommunicated. For all that I shall not stick to grant him; but I shall tell him, Christian Burial and publick Prayers and Ceremonies, were forbidden to be exhibited towards them, to terrify the living, not to endamage the soul. And so the present History tells how much other Monks were terrify'd by the example of this punishment lay'd on the Simoniackal Monk: I know some Greeks have been of the opinion that the bodies also of excommunicate persons could not dissolve into Earth untill Absolution was given to them: But I know likewise it was held to be an *Error*. And, as for this action of the Abbot, I confess I understand it not. For had he had the apprehension that the torments of Purgatory be so great as Divinity tells us, he could never methinks have with a Christian heart spoken those words, *It is now a good while since our brother who is departed remains in torments of fire, and therefore we must shew him some charity*. As who should say, I am content he hath suffer'd the pains of Purgatory for one month, nay two, for so long, it was before he designed him to be releas'd. Imagine he had caused him to be rack'd or impal'd

impal'd so long, would not all the Christian World have abominated the cruelty? What conceit then had he of Purgatory, that would let his Brother burn in that cruel fire so long without shewing him any Charity? I would to God your Divine had told us where we might find that Vindication of the Book he speaks of; For the more I consider it, the more unworthy it seems to me to be our great Doctour, and favour more of the Monk than of the Pope. Though, besides, he tells us that this story hapned three years before his writing, and *Baronius* tells that the Book was written in the fourth year of *St. Gregory's* Popedom, at which time *St. Gregory* could not be in his Monastery. Nor do I think *Baronius* can rattle *Cann*s for this opinion then, since he held it himself in his eighth Tome, and revoked it in his ninth; Therefore he may have patience with one who falls into the Errour, into which himself fell before.

9. Let us omit that ridiculous opinion of excommunicating souls in Purgatory, and answer the question he puts, what any Judicious Catholick can say to the story? Which is, that the Authour of this Book sheweth no such exact inspection into every circumstance, as that any man should be bound to believe

believe that he could not be deceived, either in his Judgment, or in his narration, as that truly *Copiosus* knew not of the saying of the Masses. And I wish you to note your Divine's advice he gives, that when the Authour makes this Argument that *concordante visione cum Sacrificio res aperta claruit*, he speaks like a Doctor. Is this Tradition, or Scripture, or Councils, upon the which Doctors proceed, or a common and ordinary prudence, by which every man conducts his private business?

10. There follow two stories out of Venerable Bede, written as an Historian should write, and as it was worthy of his Learning and Wisdome. The first is nothing to the Alledger's Purpose, being but of the profiting of the Mass to the dead, which is the position common to us both. That which he chiefly takes notice of, is this word *delivery*, or *loosing*, as if we held the souls were never to be deliver'd, or that their delivery came not to pass by prayers and other good works: So that this being agreed on, and that there is no specification of time, there is nothing particular in this story, but that many who heard this story were devoutly inflamed in faith; to wit, to pray for the dead, by which we understand that this story was

the occasion of their apprehension of sudden delivery, which hath no other ground then the paralleling of the loosing of his fetters to the help in Purgatory, which every man would guess of according to the principles he was before imbued with: So that both the effect is common to both opinions, and the ground every ones application of the Miracle to a spiritual effect, which they saw no otherwise then in a corporeal allegory. But your Divine explicates *inflamed in faith*, which as it lyes, signifies no more then that they grew fervent towards good life, to signifie that they had recieved this faith from the beginning, which, seeing there is no ground for it in the Authour, is but a kind of a corruption of the Text by the Divines addition to it.

11 The later story of *Drithelmus* hath one circumstance that favours your Divines opinion, but the very same words have a blot to mar it, that is, what yout Divine (I doubt) will acknowledg to be a flat Heresy. I mean that these words. *all shall come to Heaven in the day of Judgment*, include some who have no Obstacle of Sin, to wit, those in the *fourth place*. So that he affirms them not to go to Heaven *as soon as purged*, against the Council of Florence and *Benedictus*

dictus his Bull. Whence, by the Rule that no Revelations are to be admitted, which contain any thing inconsonant to Faith, this Revelation is to be rejected: not so far as concerns venerable *Bede*, who truly relates what *Driethelmus* not onely reported, but truly thought: But that he, *Driethelmus*, was some way deluded, either because the Vision was a natural effect of forgoing thoughts, or that he mistook himself in the rehearſal, or some such like cause, whereof the contingency of sublunary causes furnish us with store. I pray take notice also that *the works of the living* help many to be freed before the day of Judgment, be the words of the Angel, not of Venerable *Bede*; narrative, not doctrinal. Whence you may see this Divine continues still his practice, of proving earnestly that which is not in controversy, and saying little or nothing of that which is the true difficulty.

SIXTH DIVISION,

Containing an Answer to his tenth
Chapter.

Of the Nature and Certainty of private Revelations. The rare Spright in the Jesuits House at Vienna. His Relations (for what in them concerns the Alsdger's purpose) found to be in likelihood, what himself intitles them, Stories.

1. **I**N his tenth Chapter we must launch into the Ocean of *Revelations* for after once by the foregoing Relations they grew into fashion, every Spiritual body had of them, either truly or at least put upon him. Nay, this very day there want not spiritual directours, which profess a kind of skill in such a space of time to bring their Ghostly Children to Extasies and Revelations. And who doubts but that if a Devout soul of her self, subject to those passions which Galen and other Physicians call *Extases* or Enthusiasms, light into the Government of a Ghostly Father delighted with admirable accidents, both their thoughts

thoughts being continually busied upon spiritual matters, the Ghostly Father having such a pitch of Divinity as to correct in his Ghostly Child's apprehensions what is plainly naught and contrary to Faith and Christian life, both being constantly conceited that God uses to discover extraordinary verities to those who much converse with them, who, I say, can doubt but many relations of wonderfull sights must needs proceed from them, nay many times of things which verily fall out as they see them (as all Heathen Histories recount some which happened so as Philosophers teach us by a secret combination of the soul with outward causes) amongst which the Divine Providence mingles it self to work its proper ends.

2. But your Divine and I frame, about these, two propositions, seeming contrary yet so well agreeing that one good conclusion will follow out of both joyn'd together. His proposition is that these Revelations are undenyable because the Authours are known to be of great vertue and integrity, who for a world would not recommend what they thought to be a ly, or not as they deliver it; and the Relatours are either those who had the Vision, or some who had it from them immediately; so that there can likewise

likewise be no moral difficulty or doubt of their true relating. This proposition I fully acknowledge, and a man would think that in so doing, I give him full content. Here must I advance my Proposition; which, if it please him as well as his does me, I hope we shall agree in the conclusion to be drawn out of both. Mine then is, that Revelations, Visions, Apparitions, &c. cannot be certain to any body but onely to whom they are made, and by consequence it is a folly to seek to prove them to any one who doth not of his own good nature take them for true. As for the party to whom the Revelation is made, I doubt not but God may have such a kind of influence as to make it beyond all doubt that it is himself who speaks to the party; But that it must not rely upon the Authority of this party whatsoever is communicated to others, that is the position I deny. I say therefore, the security of a Revelation may be as great as the Authority of the party to whom it is made: And it must be certain to others, that such a party neither was nor could be deceived in this kind, before we can make any argument from the Revelation. Out of these two propositions I gather this conclusion. That private Relations for the most part can neither be proved

ved nor deny'd, and therefore make nothing probable or improbable, and so by Divines are to be let alone and lay'd by, to let the Historians first resolve of them whether they be true or false; which is impossible to do, unless there be some outward effects, which seldom happen in matters of Purgatory of which we treat.

3. I must add one note about his undeniable stories, that divers of his Authours are known sometimes to have miscarry'd in their Revelations, as by name St. *Brigit*, and St. *Bernard*, as likewise St. *Catharin of Sena*, St. *Mathildis* and others. And since I know no more assurance for others then for these, I believe that prudent men will neither doubt but that divers Revelations are true, nor precipitate easily to believe that this in particular is to be held for such: Nevertheless I except those apparitions which come out with Authority beyond exception. As I have light upon one which the Authour brags of, that its Authority is not begged from ancient writers, but signified by present experiences, the year the Authour printed the seventh Edition of his Book: So that it may be of as great Authority as our Authours Latin book which was translated into many Languages. It came to *Sevill*

vill where Father *Martin de Roa* a great Jesuit printed his brave Book in the year 1634, on Munday the twenty ninth of *May*, when his seventh Edition was quite done; and so it was fain to be put after the end to give you a faithfull Testimony of the duration of the pains of Purgatory. The Title of the Book is, *Estado de las almas de Purgatorio*; and you may have in it, both for Theological resolutions, and for fine stories concerning Purgatory what your heart can wish. Having told you where you may find what you want, I may contract the story it self. Not forgetting that it pass at *Vienna* in *Austria*, in the Jesuits house there, which I do not know, for they had three in that Town. The substance of the story carries, that a woman one hundred and thirty four years before had killed her two Children with poyson, and dyed six and thirty years and an half afterward, having recieved the Sacraments; and suffered incredible torments ninety four years and four months. And the Authour notes that surely they all three had no body to pray for them that they lay so long in Purgatory. First appeared one of the sons to a lay Brother as he went to see whether all doors were wel shut; and lay'd hands on him to carry him to the Church

Church; but being contented with the promise of three Masses, let him go to bed: Yet as it seems, repenting of his bargain, two hours after rising to his bed, to get him out of his bed to go to the Church, though being fed with the promise of four Masses more it left him; but so broken with resisting the violence of the spirit that he could not stir himself. Some three weeks after he came again two several nights with the like violence; and some eight days after came again (as it seems) more gently, and waking him out of his sleep bad him say nothing and follow him, but the Brother speaking and asking what he was, vanished away. Now whether the souls in Purgatory want civility to treat one so rudely of whom they desire succour, or that they do not understand how to insinuate themselves without frightening of People I leave to your Divine, for the Author gives no account, nor likewise why he could not endure to be spoken to. A while after the spirit came to his chamber, and led him silent into the Church, where were other two spirits; but all vanished as soon as the Brother being frightened cry'd out: and he was found on the Floor in a Town, from which the Physician freed him; yet was he not for some days

days able to go, he was so weakned: Eight days after he had a new vision, and the next night the apparition of two of the Spirits, who after a great intreating that he would not speak, told him the story above mentioned, and having intreated some prayers, and that he would keep fast and silence 34 hours, let him alone so long, and then appeared all glorious, though two of them before had appeared all white, and the first ever, yet they were all three delivered together. It seems the two Children expected their Mother. They told him how they meant to have led him to their Mother's grave, whom he should have seen in such a case that it would have killed him, if they had not negotiated for his life by the Intercession of their good Angels, because it was revealed unto them, that by his prayers they should that year be set free.

4. I doubt not but that the great Divine; will out of this Revelation draw high points of Divinity, and enrich the Art of Apparitions greatly. It must needs be more certain then Venerable *Bede's* revelations, seeing at least three housefull of *Jesuits* were witnesses to the whole Process. Therefore it is no doubt but it is as strong a principle of Divinity, as any, if not all the Revelations hitherto

hitherto cited; and set forth expressly to inform the Christian World of the conditions of Purgatory. I pray then use your diligence to your great Divine to know of him some points in particular. As why the children who could be but young when they dyed, should be six and thirty years in Purgatory longer then the Mother, since that there is no mention of such enormous sins of theirs as that of their Mother, nor of any extraordinary penance the Mother had done. Secondly, Why they should stay in Purgatory or at least out of Heaven untill their Mother was released. For First one appeared all in white, the other in black; afterwards they both in white, and the Mother partly white, partly black, as if some sins were forgiven, and others not. Why Souls are sent to straggle with People? Why they stand not to their bargains but after having been contented, return again to molest the Party? Why they afflict their Benefactors? How, if a separated Soul offered violence a man could resist it? Why they forbid him to speak, Whereas in other Visions they can not speak untill they be spoken to? Why the Spirits vanish if the man spake or cry'd out? Why he must fast just 34. houres, and keep silence so long?

and you may add what your self shall think
good to enlarge the *Saints of the first and
last in Purgatory*. For as to my self I cannot
consider such fine stories, without a great
suspicion of folly and superstition in those
who tell and believe them. And if you ask
me what I can guess to be the very truth, I
think some body of the House. (for he notes
it was a Colledge) had a mind to abuse the
poor Brother, and when they had begun and
saw it take well, they sought how to bring
it unto such an end as might hinder it to be
sought into. Therefore they had a great
care he should not make any noise, and as
soon as he did, got themselves away: there-
fore the ode came once with a *twinge* in his
hand, that if any one should come, they
might not lay hands on him. Therefore
when there was company with him, they
came not into the Chamber. And therefore,
when they would give the upshot to the
whole story, they caused him to fast and
moulder upon his own thoughts untill his
brain was so weak, that he might believe he
saw whatsoever they would have him say.
As for the Jesuits of *Vienna*, I conceive they
went innocently to work, further then what
much talking and verdicting upon the busi-
ness, did (unawares to them) after the story.

ry. You may object that the Book is licensed by the same Inquisition. I do not deny it, and that as for one of the qualifications (as they call them.) I knew him and bear him very willingly this witness, that he was a very pious man, of a sweet condition, a clear wit, and, according to the course of the Jesuits schools, a great Divine. But all this makes no authority that cannot be deceived in a matter of fact, as the Divines speak, as all Apparitions and Revelations be.

But peradventure your Divine will reply he brings Testimonies which were evident. Here (saith he in his 7 N.) is no *secreta Vision, no private Revelation, cuius nec defensor sola est.* The words of this dead man professing that he should soon be freed from Purgatory, and his refreshing life upon the score were spoken before thousands, and therefore is but the very first degree of Historical certitude. His story is the famous and known relation of St. Stanislaus, how he raised one Peter that had sold him a piece of ground, and brought him into the Court to bear witness that he had pay'd him for his ground, which being done, the man retired to his grave again? Thus far the History hath the grounds he makes such a noise with. But your Divine adds that St. Stanislaus

offer'd *Peter* to continue in this life if he would, which *Peter* refused because of the uncertainty of salvation in it, and that now his Purgatory was almost at an end, yet pray'd the St. to make it shorter by his prayers. By which story we may learn many things which heretofore we were ignorant of. As that it doth not affright a man so much to be in Purgatory, as to see Purgatory, since *Drithelmus* onely by seeing it liv'd so secure a life that there was no danger of loosing Eternity. Secondly that *Peter* had not got the Charity which some Saints profess'd in this life, that it was more pleasing to God to live in this world with hazard, to do good for our neighbours, then to go to Heaven immediately. Much less had he learn'd the Charity of *St. Christina mirabilis* to live in torments to save others out of Purgatory. Nor also did he consider of this world are lesser then those of Purgatory. Nor had he got the skill that souls have learned since, to know how many Masses or Alms will set them free: Neither that one Mass of so great a Saint at a priviledged Altar would free him instantly: Nor (it seems) not so much as that *St. Stanislaus* was not deaf: Seeing your Divine testifies that he spake so loud that thousands might be witnesses

nesses of them. Nevertheless this Argument of your Divine has this advantage over the rest, that it hath the Authority of being a *History*; and deserves the Credit which we give to *Livy*, or *Platarch*, or *Dio*, when they tell us of prodigious events. For *Longinus* the Canon of *Cracovia*, out of whom the other Authors have this History, is esteemed of good Judgment, and although he lived long after the fact, and had it *ex antiquioribus monumentis*, as *Baronius* testifies, and so the story be not of the first degree of Historical certitude, yet because he is a grave man, an ordinary Historical faith is not to be deny'd him. But, since your Divine charges me amongst other Readers to take no ice that this History is contained in *Cromerus* his Books of *Lessons*, approved by the Sea Apostolick; Surely he imagined this Approbation to be a Definition *ex Cathedra*, or would have his Reader think so. For he could not be ignorant how many times the Lessons of the Roman Breviary have been corrected, old ones put out, and new ones put in. The like in Missals, Rituals, &c. he could not be ignorant that such an Approbation breeds no more Authority then of a grave History, which *Cromerus* hath of himself,

though he be taxed to be the first Brother of that sweet History of *Hops Joan*, and therefore no rest of truth.

At least we cannot doubt but the ending History is in the first degree of Historical credit. For it was performed in the sight of the whole two Countries of *Liege* and *Brabant*. The recorder of the story, chook follow to *St. Thomas of Aquin*, and writes he could bring innumerable witnesses to testify the truth of all he did write. *Jacques*, also, *de Vierre*, a famous Cardinal, is an irrefragable witness of the same story. And Cardinal *Bellarmine* holds it to be undeniable. Who then dare doubt of such a History so thoroughly authenticated? I confess it is against my will to make any doubt of it; and should easier hold it for a History not to be mentioned, then to write my opinion of it. For, considering the story with abstraction from the Author who wrote it, no man could judge it worth the degree of a Romance, but rather a pure Fable of *Gargames*, invented for to please Children, or rather to disgrace the Catholick opinion concerning Purgatory. It hath no respect to nature, making this supernatural Ghost to be now a *bird*, now a *Fish*, now a kind of an *Insect* to live in fire. And, for acts of Christian

Christian life, and to increase in various
actions and examples, little or nothing! All
miraculous, all hideous sufferings, a life not
imitable, wholly corporeal, little spiritual
tye: but setting aside the imagin' of good of
freeing souls out of Purgatory, would not be
fit to mention before a prudent Auditory.
What necessity can be thought of in the souls
of Purgatory for those forty years of her
life that was neither before nor since? All
St. Odile's and the *Gloisy* Monastery's pray-
ers were begun before: I hear no body of op-
inion that there go fewer souls to Purgato-
ry since, then in her days. What extraordi-
nary zeal of God Almighty was it to raise
such a great assistance to the souls for one
Age? Let us think a little farther: Could so
strange a miraculousness endure forty years,
and not all Christian People from all parts of
Christendom resort to it? Would not
all Princes, specially neighboring ones,
cause it to be examin'd, and have archiepi-
cal relations brought to them? Would not
innumerable foundations for the dead have
been made out of the Astonishment of the
world at such rare miracles? Would not all
Histories, all Chronicles have made mention
of it? Would not the Popes themselves have
sent to have examin'd it? Where are all

these Testimonies? *Cantipratensis* was a worthy man, and has at large written the story, true it is. But if you confer him with *Gregory* the Authour of the Dialogues, you may think he may as well be deceived as he was, and was no less given to collect pious stories than the Pope. He affirms he could bring innumerable witnesses then living for what he wrote. This is a sign it was much talked on, and a popular story in every mans mouth, but how many of this great number would have proved *eyewitnesses* is not let down; though when a famous story is in vogue, every one who hath been in the Country will be ashamed to say he had not seen it. The Church hath done wisely and worthily in later Ages to command Miracles should not be published without first being examin'd: which if it had been done by *Cantipratensis*, I doubt this story would have fallen very short. Yes, but it hath the authentication of two Cardinals, to wit, of *Jacobus a Viterbo*, and *Bellarmin*. As for the former, he is accounted an able man; but the quality of his approbation being not set down by your Authour, I may easily conjecture it is but some memory of fame and hearsay, which gives no great confirmation. And as for *Bellarmin*, this story puts me in mind

mind, how that good Cardinal was newly dead when I went first into Rome, and the report of his worth in every mans mouth; and amongst other commendations, one was of his Christian simplicity, and that he was according as we phrase it in English, a *meer Scholler*, and understood not the ways of the world, but was subject to be deluded by fraudulent Persons: And some Learned men have extended the same Censure to his works, full of great reading, but without any great choice and judgment in his Arguments.

7. There wanted yet a piece of cunning Rhetorick to set forth these goodly Merchandizes. You shall have it in the fifth Number: There he tells you that without holding your self wiser then St. Gregory, and the rest, you have heard of all this while, you cannot hold the contrary. Who would have expected so absurd a proposition from a Divine? In a manner their whole study and pains is to impugn one the other, and dissent from great and little, and must we be bound to think they think themselves wiser or better then all from whom they dissent? He himself confessedly will dissent from two of the chief of these he cites St. Bernard and St. Thomas about our Ladies Conception.

Conception, peradventure also from *San-
ris* and *Vasquez* in other points: Shall we
therefore think he esteems himself wiser than
they? As to the particulars we have already
answer'd, and many of those besides, they
are not the men themselves, but the writers
of their lives, whose information how good
it was we cannot tell; though it be but too
evident, that the writers of *Saints* lives are
for the most part desirous to speak the most
good of their subject, which they ad-
mise; and therefore a slight information is
sufficient to make them give credit to what is
spoken in their favour; specially in mirac-
lous things. To end his Chapter he hath an-
other pretty subject; to wit, to persuade
his Reader that I think that anciently there
were no *Visions*; and so cites *St. Austin*; re-
fusing there were many who had seen the
pains of Hell; the which as it is nothing to
the purpose, so is it a cunning slander to
suggest to people that we utterly deny such
Miracles.

And thus, shall be my most humble
and sincere service to your Lordship
and I shall be bound to think that
you will be so good as to write or
send me word from whom they
most lately have been taken. I am
from the office of the Lord Bishop
of Exeter and the Dean of Exeter
Council.

SEVENTH

SEVENTH DIVISION

Containing an Answer to the eleventh and
twelfth Chapter.

His weak Attempts from Liturgies, Rituals,
and Officers, with what folly he charges Heresy
and Excommunication upon the Doctrine
of the Middle State. How the Pope truly
applies the merits of the Saints to the as-
sistence of souls in Purgatory. The Pope's
Bull correctly alleged. The Bull of Leo
the tenth against Luther, not touching the
Authors Doctrine. What Authority the
Council of Trent gave the Pope. No An-
tiquarian Testimony of the Antiquity of In-
dulgence for the dead.

IN HIS eleventh Chapter pretends to
show out of the Liturgies and Rituals
the Testimony of the Church against the
delivery at the day of Judgment. But to fill
this new head he repeats first divers of those
he brought before, as that from St. Am-
brose's prayer before Mass, The Churches
prayer that the dying person may never
come in Purgatory, He mingles the pray-
ers

ers for the dying with the prayers for the dead, as if they must needs signify the same; specially because the Church so lately prayed for her not going to Purgatory, therefore she must needs after death pray for it again; as if in different cases the time ought to make the request the same. Otherwise, all be brings after death is common to both opinions; and still he presses that to be going out of the body, and being in Purgatory, be the self-same occasions. The like is his confirmation out of a prayer common to the living and dead; as if we had not the wit to know their necessities were different, but that we must pray that God should give both the same gifts. I am ashamed to spend time and paper on so gross mistakes, not without admiration how zeal and obedience can blind so far a man of otherwise a good understanding.

2. There follows the repetition of the Gothick Liturgy; the which, if it be found to be a Catholick Liturgy; notwithstanding the Phrase be Millenarian; at least cannot serve him. For the Text of the Apocalyps doth plainly speak of Martyrs who cannot be pray'd for otherwise then for the receiving of their bodies at the last resurrection, or honour in this world.

3. His last Authority is from the Churches
 Acceptation of the custom St. *Odilo* began of
 praying for the dead generally the second of
November. But it is not enough for him un-
 less he adds of his own that the Church did
 it for the same end, or upon the same Mo-
 tive on which St. *Odilo* did; the which if he
 could prove he would say something: But
 there is nothing but his conjecture for that;
 seeing St. *Odilo* himself is like to have taken
 it from an higher origin, it being known that
 the custom was in the Church two hundred
 years before; though not universally; and
 the reason of it, that as All-Saints-Day was
 instituted for such Saints as had not private
 days, so this day for those dead who had not
 private service say'd for them, which is likely
 to be the Churches intention in celebrating
 this office, though St. *Odilo* was the occasion
 of it. For the Church is tenacious of Ancient
 professions, and is not lightly to be thought
 to take up new opinions, which that it did
 your Divine will be hardly able to prove,
 and so he may put in his pocket his sentence
 out of St. *Austin* concerning the oppoling of
 what the whole Church practises. For one
 thing is the Practice, which he acknowledges,
 another thing the Reason, which stands only
 upon his slight guesses.

4. The like invention be obtained upon us, that all the stories of the Martyrologe be Articles of faith; a position that never wise man thought of. Yet forsooth because the name of *Arschafine* is in the Martyrologe, the Church must hold it forth for a truth. Is not this an insufferable abuse, both of the Church and of all her faithfull Children? to impose upon them a necessity to believe stories partly corrected, partly of new corrigible when it shall please the Church to look into them, for innumerable Doctrines of that uncontrollable Mistress? And these men forsooth must pass for great Divines whose verdict must carry this world.

5. His twelfth Chapter is all fire, and nothing but Excommunication and Damnation. As for my Doctrine, he tells us that it professeth that the Church to the living remitterh not the satisfaction due to God alone; but that which belongs to God and her, and as far as experiences can guide us, I think the Church holds with me. In the Roman absolution is pronounced *Quicquid boni feceris vel mali sustinneris sit tibi in remissionem peccatorum*; This I ever understood to belong to the satisfaction due to God, and I see the words may extend themselves to

Purgatory

Purgatory is hell as to this world. But I never heard that what we were to do or suffer in this world was remitted by Indulgences. Of Purgatory I can only say, we that walk by five Senses have no experience what Indulgences do there: But nevertheless if your Divine can bring any Rule of Faith for it I shall not any way resist. His first proof is out of *Maldonat*. His discourse is that *Indulgences* are proportionable to *Church-penances*; but *Church-penances* are impos'd to satisfy not only before the Tribunal of the *Church*, but also before the Tribunal of *God*; so then do *Indulgences* also. This is the first part of the excellent declaration of *Maldonat*, which had the ill luck so light upon such a dull Reader that understood not the consequence, how it follow'd, that because the *Churches* penance (if it had been performed) would have diminish'd the pain which should have satisfy'd *God*; therefore if they be not performed, so it be by the *Churches* consent, they will nevertheless satisfy for those which were due to *God*. I never understood that either the *Church* knew how much was due to *God*; nor, that *Gods* judgments were to be bound up to the *Churches*; but that the Rule that man judges according to his appearance, and *God* according

truth had run in this as well as in all things else.

6. This then is the first folly of this discourse, that whereas *binding and loosing*; being ratify'd in Heaven, means that Christ ratifies it here towards the Government of the Church; this excellent explication without the least proof applies it to Gods *Spiritual Tribunal*, and confounds the *external Tribunal* set up in this world with the *secret Tribunal* of Gods inerrant judgments. His next folly is that he takes this Principle, that God doth not punish twice that which himself confesseth was never punished but once, but remitted. But the most bold folly of this discourse is, that the whole discourse is common to punishments in this world, as well as in the next. For the Council of *Trent* declares expressly, that good works and sufferings of this world do satisfy for the pains due to sin in Gods judgment, which are to be payd in the next world if not in this. Then the plenary Indulgence which exempts from all pain due in Purgatory, frees from all which in this world would have served for the remission of Purgatory pains; so that a plenary Indulgence will save the Drunken man from the dropsie, the quarellsome man from being beaten or wounded,

wounded, the luxuriant man from foul diseases, say, the Robber from the Gallows: For no man can deny that all these are due punishments of sin, or that received no judgments of God, they do not diminish the future torments of Purgatory, if not quite take them away: So that none of all this can fall upon him who hath received a plenary Indulgence; but God, by this excellent Discourse a discourse, must punish him twice for the same fault.

Upon this solid Foundation your Divine, buildeth the bloody scaffold of no less then Heresy and Excommunication against my Doctrine. The censure of Heresy began a 478 lay'd upon it as he tells you by *Sixtus Quintus*. The proposition upon which it is lay'd (as he reciter it) is that *the Bishop of Rome cannot pardon the pains of Purgatory*. Then followeth the Thunder and Lightning. Aperswade my self when you read this you could think no otherwise then that I was fallen into open Heresy, for the censure says it containeth manifest Heresie: unless your Divine gave you occasion to think otherwise, by adding to the same words in his next Number, *denying that the Pope by any Indulgence can pardon the pain of Purgatory*. Now this word by any Indulgence, being not in

the proposition, your Divine will permit me not to fall under the censure of the Bull: If I confess the Pope can forgive the pains of Purgatory *otherwise then by Indulgences*; and seeing he finds nothing spoken in my Book but of Indulgences, before he can press this Decree against me, he must shew there is no other way of remitting Purgatory pains: Which certainly there is, since all Catholics agree, that the *satisfactions and prayers of the faithfull, and alms-giving, do assist the souls of Purgatory*: So that the Pope by such means may redress the souls of Purgatory more assuredly then by *Indulgences*. And when this is done by way of *Command*, it is as full and perfectly a pardon to the souls, as if it be done by the *application of the merits of the Saints*: For they are assuredly in the Popes Jurisdiction, and may be applyed by him, of the others: it is questionable, and otherwise the way is the same, both being the *applying of the Church's merits*.

8. Yet have I one scruple more about this point: Why your Divine changed the words of the Sentence condemned by the Bull, which I find to be *Quod Papa non potest indulgere alicui vivo penam Purgatorii*. Now these words *alicui vivo*, quite alters the question, and makes that the Bull doth

no way touch what the Pope can do to the
 soules in Purgatory; and detaching out of
 these words wholly misrepresents both the Bull
 and the Pope, making him speak against the
 received opinion of Divines, both before and
 since his time. With for the most part agree
 that the Pope hath no Jurisdiction over Purga-
 tory, and cannot absolve men from the pains
 of it: Which is contradictory directly to the
 words your Divine cites; to wit; that the
 Bishop of Rome can pardon the pains of Purga-
 tory. For a proposition taken abstractedly
 to be censur'd, must be understood in the
 proper sence of the words; and the proper
 sence of these words, *The Pope can forgive
 the pains of Purgatory*, is that he hath Power
 and Jurisdiction over Purgatory to forgive
 punishments there; which some one Divine
 may have held; but 'tis generally rejected
 even by *Martinus Rex* this great *Wilsouire*.
 What should I think of this senseless pro-
 ceeding, and corrupting a Pope's Bull in so
 main a point? Truly the good opinion I
 have of the Author of the Book, will not
 let me think he did it maliciously, but rather
 to guess that the Ballary cosen'd him, having
 copy'd this Bull out of some negligent Tran-
 scriber, to whose Errour I impute this fault.
 For the Ballary is not a publick work, but

the collection of a private Anshour who cannot be free from such mischances. Wherefore I desire to understand, that the Treatise is one of the Authentick Copies which are conserved in Spain.

Next he brings in the Bull of the tenth against Luther, to what purpose is hard to say. For I do not know, that any man makes difficulty of the three propositions he cites as therein condemned. The propositions are these. The first that the *Treasures of the Church* whensoever the Pope giveth *Indulgences* do not merit the merits of Christ and his Saints. This proposition was well condemned in Luther, who denied Indulgences, and the Pope's Authority in them, but what it hath to do with my opinion, who profess that the Pope, when he remits sins, or the pains due unto them, doth it in the same Authority in which St. Paul did, who clearly says he does it *in Person Christ* I do not understand: For I think that includes the merits of Christ, and to be an immense Treasure, if it can be called a Treasure, that cannot be consumable in the least part of it.

The next condemned proposition is that *Indulgences* to those who do truly gain them, do not avail them to gain pardon of the pain due to actual sins by the Divine Justice. This proposition

position may well be *Duke's*, a boyishrous fellow, more clamorous than understanding. But how it can be apply'd to my way of discouraging, who protests all punishments Natural, Civil and Ecclesiastical which follow sin, to be the punishments due to God's Justice, which is the plain sense of Scriptures, Fathers, and Councils, falls not into my brain. For assuredly he gains not Indulgences, who gains not the remission of some of these pains. *11.* The third proposition brought for condemned, is that *to six kinds of men Indulgences are neither necessary nor profitable, to wit, to the Dead, &c.* As for this proposition I think his want of Divinity is cause why he applies it to me, because he understands not how any thing can profit the dead, unless it be immediately put into their hands. Which Error of his likely enough is the cause of applying all the rest to my Doctrine. For when he hears the Pope pronounce these propositions to be false, he presently apprehends the Pope had the same fancies which he has, and therefore can mean nothing else but what rings in his Ears. Whereas Pope's use to hear all opinions, and then to declare so abstractedly, as not to hurt any Catholic Tenet, but onely what is against all Catholic Doctors.

no 12. But to understand more fully the case, it is not amiss to set down a discourse related by *Francesco Chiericati*, Bishop of *Fabriano*, and *Nuncio* to the Diet of *Nuremberg* against *Luther*, sent by *Adrian* the sixth, with whom he had much acquaintance and confidence. He wrote a Diary of what passed in *Rome* in the beginnings of *Adrian* the sixth's reign, and in it this History. How this good Pope had (as it is yet to be seen in his works) written of the nature of Indulgences; and his opinion was, that when an Indulgence was granted to any one for doing a good work, the work might be so done, that the whole Indulgence might be gained; But if the work were not performed perfectly enough, then the performer gaineth so much of the Indulgence as answereth in proportion to the imperfect work. This thought the good Pope to decree at *Caserta*, and propound it to the whole Church; but first communicated his thoughts to Cardinal *Caietan*, who had been a great Student of this question by order of *Leo* the Tenth; and by the necessity of dealing with *Luther*; and both a better Divine, and more practised in the World then *Adrian* was. This man, as to the substance of the Divinity question agreed with the Pope, and told him, that

that he steadfastly believ'd the Doctrine in his conscience, yet had so carry'd it in his writings, that none but the most Learned men could draw it from his words. Further he gives reasons why he thought it not fitting this Doctrine should be made too publick to the common people.

This story the Authour of the Roman History of the Council of *Trent* doth much disparage. And as far as concerns the Historical Verity, it concerns not me; but that at least it is *historically*, that is a likely and rational History, seems to me evident, out of the opinions of the two men extant, not onely in their works, but confessed in the Roman History. For he confesses, *lib. 1. c. 4.* that the subtilty, that *Adrian* the sixth invented, consisted in this, that every good external act might bud out of so great a charity, that it might deserve the concession of any Indulgence never so large. And that the Pope intendeth never to give any larger Indulgence, then what may be directly given in regard of such an act including the charity with which it is done. Now the question is wherein consists the difference of these two explications, *The Pope gives proportionable to the desert of the Act, and the Pope gives what is fit to be given according to*

the proportion of the *Mt.* And considering that the Pope hath no means to judge of the quantity of the Charity, nor of what part of Christ's satisfaction is proportioned to a known degree of Charity. I believe the Pope's Judgment must be referred to Christ's Judgment, which is known to be proportioned to that Charity, making the effect of the Prayer according to the Desert of the Prayer. I not deny but that the way of explicating this same verity may be made with taking a greater or lesser compass, or by diverse mediums in one way, then in the other; but that the effect is not the same in both, that is it whereof I am not capable. Whether the Reasons father'd upon *Catholicism*, why it was not fit to publish this Doctrine be good or no, concerns not me to dispute, but rather to execute. For when niceties which are beyond the ordinary capacity, are disputed before unlearned and unskilful people, they will be sure to follow the easier part, let the truth ly where it will. The Author of the Catholick History is so favourable to this explication of *Adrian* the sixth, that he citeth for the same St. *Bernardine*, *Richardus*, *Gabriel*, *Maior*, *Gerson*, *Relinus*, and Pope *Innocentius*: And thinks the cause why *Adrian* did not decide this question was, because

cause divers Divines held the contrary opinion: Which, if the other History be true, cannot be so, for he was resolved to have determin'd it before, though he could never be ignorant that others held the contrary, having himself set down four divers opinions of Catholicks concerning Indulgences.

14. To apply this story to our purpose, I understand that these two explanations differing not in the Effect, but onely in the Way to the End, the Definition of *Law* the tenth is true in both, and so when he sayth that *Indulgences are granted out of the Treasury of Christ's Merits*, it is true whether those Merits be that which giveth the efficacy to the Pope's grant, or whether it be that it is the matter he useth. Likewise, when it is said, *Indulgences received profit the living*, that is true and maintained whether the debt be paid by commutative Justice, giving God one thing for another, or whether God cancels the debt by good will as pleased with the action done. Neither is there any substantial difference in respect of the *Dead*, by what means the good they receive from the living comes to them, so it comes from the living's receiving the Indulgence: Whether I mean it comes by the vertue of the Action done by the receiver of the Indulgence,

gence, or by the like Commutation as some Divines put in the living.

15. I was about to have made a distinct explication of this question in this place, but being pressed here to clear the Authorities, and expecting there will be a place for Reason hereafter, though not in his Doctrine, yet when he comes to oppose mine, and foreseeing that the explication would make this Chapter very long, I thought better to defer it, and to go on with the answering of his Authorities. Onely I would intreat you to comfort the good soul, and tell him, that if I could have foreseen those lamentable tears, which he shed for my sake, I would have done my endeavour to have presented him with some crums of comfort beforehand, that might have stopped the dissolving of the melting humour. Now I shall present him with a clean handkercher to dry his water'd Checks: and it is no other, then the censure of the Authour of the Catholick History of the Council of *Trent*, on the Bull of Pope *Leo*, which so much distempers his brain. This Authour then, whose Authority I doubt not but is sacred to him, in his first Book, Ch. 21. N. 4. being to give an account why the form of the condemnation of *Luthers* propositions was given respectively, without

without qualifying every proposition with a singular censure, hath these words: *The Pope therefore, intended not by his Constitution to take away all doubt, of which kind of doubts God's will is that all the knowledge of this life should be full, and chiefly Divinity, as that which hath branches more obscure, and more above our understanding.* But wisely intended we should have as much certain as our strength; that is, be declared those sentences to be pernicious to teach, and dangerous to believe. Now, in case all that this Bull condemns, if it be not otherwise known to be false, may be true, let him wipe his eyes with the charitable conceit, that he who holds any of them may have found that truly those which he holds are true, and therefore now no more dangerous to believe, and much less to teach; and out of this charitable persuasion keep his fool-pious expressions to entertain Children with. As for his Readers, he sends them away to B. Fisher, to know what opinions I hold; for otherwise I do not know how he can teach them, that I hold propositions in the same sense that *Luther* does. It seems it is the mode of this Age, to look the farthest off they can from an Authour; and his Writings, when they will determine what his meaning is.

16. In his eighth N. he says, who can be the Doctrin contrary to all these Articles not the Doctrin of the Universal Church. And my answer is, that for my part I doubt not of it. But, whosoever believes the Author of the Catholick History of Trent will tell him he does not know why these Articles be not of those which God will have to be doubtfull, and that it is a Blasphemy to call that the Doctrin of the Universal Church, which is as yet uncertain, and as far as we know, false. Nevertheless he will now put it out of all doubt. For he tells you the Council of Trent doth expressly decree, that *not only in the censuring of a few Articles, but even in the censuring of whole volumes of Books, all Christians should stand to the decrees of the Bishop of Rome, and that every doubt of that nature shall be terminated (and quite ended) by his Judgment and Authority.* And after some few lines he adds, *And this must be admitted as undoubted by those who will and must admit this Definition of a General Council.* You see a horrible charge. Will you know the truth of the business. The Council of Trent had given the charge to a Committee to review such Books as they thought fitting to have conversant in the hands of Catholics; When they were ready

ready to break off, these men came in and told the Council they had performed their charge. But, because it was time to end, the Council referred the execution of the Decree to the Pope, as also of the setting forth the Catechism, and reforming the Missal and the Breviary, and ordered the Popes determination in any question that rose about these Books should be held for decisive.

17. If I had been left to mine own Judgment, I should have thought this no great honour to the Pope; further than as it was a good Action in him to consent to the good of the Church. For if the Pope had refused it, they must have appointed some Congregation to have done the same, as we see the Inquisition and Provincial Councils to have done the like in divers Countries. Now your great Divine finds in this great Myſtery, that the Council gave the Pope Authority to determine the Verity of all propositions. Was there ever such a piece of Mountebankery? Or is not the Pope well set up to have got such Champions to proclaim his Power and Authority? And what again has Divinity made, that now we have so many Articles of faith confirmed by the Definition a General Council, that must be received, as there be sentences either put out, or allowed

low'd in the Books censured in the *Index
Expurgatorius*? I must not conceal his De-
monstration for this Learned Conclusion
Could (saith he) the Council give him au-
thority to do that after the sitting of the Coun-
cil, which by his own Authority he could not do
by himself before the Council? And thus of
this infer, that the Pope doerit by his own
Authority. As for his question I will not
meddle with it, but hold it at present for one
of those doubtfull Articles, which God will
not have known, though he may find many
Divines, who would answer him that the
Council could; but what I am certain of is,
that the Council could not give him that
which he had before; and therefore your
Divine contradicts himself in alledging the
Council for giving the power, and saying he
had it before.

18. The following Numbers untill the
twelfth are but Repetitions of the same.
Only one Argument of his tenth number is
worth the noting, where he asks *probat
sic* the Council of Trent approved not the
the Pope's proceeding in this point? It is an-
swer'd, onely they that read the Council, or
otherwise have understood that the Coun-
cil never took notice, neither to nor fro,
what the Popes had done in this kind. But
he

he urges, that the Council left to the Pope the ordering of the faults and abuses in the matter of Indulgences. And who knows not (who knows any thing of those times) that the Pope promised to reform what belonged to the Court of Rome by himself? So that the Council had no need to meddle in such points, in which it is expected the Pope would do well of himself. Now, whether the Pope reformed all that deserved reformation, or no, is a thing impertinent to our question, in which there is all agreement to the Popes decrees, and tis a thing not fitting to be made publick table-talk, as our Books are like to be.

In the twelfth Number he seeks the *Antiquity of the use of Indulgences for the dead*. And no wonder he cannot find any great Antiquity for them, seeing *Cicero*, and our Holy Bishop of *Rockingham*, had looked before him, and could find none. *Cicero's* words be *Opus*. 16. *et*. No Holy Scripture, no written Authority of Ancient Doctors, either Greek, or Latin hath brought this (the beginning of Indulgences) to our knowledge. But this onely concerning Ancient Fathers is written some three hundred years since, that St. *Gregory* began the Indulgences of the Stations. These Indulgen-

ces were, as I remember, of seven years pen-
 nances remission for visiting certain Church-
 es, no mention of any for the dead granted
 by St. Gregory. But what says the great Bi-
 shop? *Ipse loquitur* (says he) *per adventum*
magis uti to trust very much in these Indul-
 gences, that the use of them seems to be too new
 and very late invented amongst Christians. I
 answer (sayth he) That it is not certain who
 first began them, and some say that amongst
 the most Ancient Romans there was some kind
 of use of them. Nor, doth any man doubt but
 that later writers have both better examined, and
 clearly understood many things, both out of the
 Gospels and other Scriptures, then their Pre-
 decessors. So that you see this great man
 thought that the Scriptures explicated onely
 by human wit were the solid Foundation
 upon which Indulgences were to be ground-
 ed, for want of Ancient Testimony. Not so
 your Divine, but he can prove it out of An-
 cient Records, and first of Paschal the first,
 some eight hundred or more years since,
 which is a very long time (as he well notes)
 for the Church to be in Error. This Paschal
 is sayd to have given an Indulgence to the
 Church of St. Praxedis in Rome, for the free-
 ing of one soul out of Purgatory. But the ill
 luck is that this Monument is accounted to be

be Apocryphal in Rome it self, and not esteemed of by men accurate in History of chrit nature. And so neither *Cassian* who was very Inquisitive, nor *Baronius* ever alledged it. And *Faber's* story of its being approved by eleven Popes, if properly understood, must needs declare as much; seeing it is impossible any writer living in Rome could be ignorant of so notorious a thing. But I pray take notice by the way of the spirit of these men, to abhor it. See how they keep the souls of those who will believe them in an Egyptian slavery, perswading them that if this Pope had committed a private fault, the Church had been in an Error 840 years, even though no more know of the Popes mistake, then have heard of this piece of Paper lying in a private Secristy. As to *Bellarmines* approbation we answer, he is to be thanked for his pains, of gathering so many things together; not to be proposed for an Authority, for the reasons I alledged above in the like occasion. A. 10. m. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. The next instance is our of *Baronius*, ob. *Spondan* in the year 878: how Pope John the eighth gave an Indulgence to all whose ships had been waye in the war for the defence of the Church, or whose ships should be taken away. Before we look into this Testimony,

and the dead, or rather onely for the dead, and given immediatly to the dead, (which is a new story in the Catholick Church, if it be spoken in the new sense of Indulgences) no mention made of remission of sins or pains, this being the first mentioned towards the dead, and *Spondetur* in no reputation of a Divine, I see not why this word *Indulgentia* should be taken for the remission of sins or pains due to God, rather then for the relaxation of some Ecclesiastical Duties or Obligations which such Souldiers might have incurred in their life times, in which times the stories record great violences offer'd by the Gentry to the Clergy, and Ecclesiastical Liberty. And if you object, that it is not to my Divines purpose, unless it be understood of the pains in Purgatory; I answer it was his duty to have made his objection home, who could not chuse but have the command of good Libraries, in one whereof my last interview with him happend. For this Pope was no such man as to authorise a new Institution in the Church, being infamous both for his loose life, by which he is suspected to have given occasion to the tale of Pope Joan; and for *prudencia carnis*, that is Worldliness. So that he is not much to be suspected of beginning of spiritual customs,

nor would such novelties have come gracefully from him. Wherefore I know no elder then *Gelasius* the second, who lived in the twelfth Age, and though he were a little Ancienter then *Peter Lombard*, yet cannot be esteemed before all school-men, for *Rome* was not built in a day. Wherefore, if I had said the Scholastick Divines were the first inventers of these Indulgences, it had neither been concluded false, nor to have proceeded out of the ignorance of Antiquity. Since your Divine acknowledges, that *St. John Damascen* was Prince of the Scholasticks of the Greek Church, who lived divers Ages before *Peter Lombard*. But the truth is my chief aim was at this manner of explicating Indulgences, by a Treasure whence every one got from the Pope a share to pay his debts; which, as far as I find, came not into the indulgent Bulls, untill *Clement* the sixth's time, which was two hundred years after *Gelasius* the second. Of the which manner of explication your Divine treats untill the end of this Chapter. But because it supposes many by-questions, is not to be treated by snatches, and therefore I shall put it off untill a more commodious place, when all his Authorities shall be answered.

EIGHTH DIVISION

**Containing an Answer to the twelfth and
thirteenth Chapters.**

*Remarks of several Follies and Mistakes of
the Author's Doctrin; as also of Councils,
and Pope Benedict his Bull.*

1. I had conceived good hopes I might have passed over the next Chapter with silence, having found the Title of it concerns the two Councils of *Trent* and *Sess*, & knowing the Council of *Sess* went no farther than *Trent*, & that the Council of *Trent* was already shew'd to have nothing against our opinion, and to contain it self within the verities acknowledged by both parties, which also I found to be true, and that the whole Chapter is employ'd to shew how really he thinks and would prove, that we put no pains due to Gods justice after the remission of the sin, which if it were true, yet it follow'd not that we opposed the Council, but that we missed in some Doctrin consequent, which he would draw to be a contempt of the Council. And the truth is for the main Doctrin of this

Chapter, I intend to remit it untill after the explication of my opinion, for there is nothing in it to require any explication of the Councils, but onely to see how consequentially we proceed to the Doctrine of the Councils which we profess. Nevertheless, as the Scripture warns us, in much talking there must needs drop some folly, and so I am forced to some notes even upon this Chapter, for fear I should afterwards forget them.

1. My first note shall be that in his third Number, he puts it for the Doctrine of Councils, that *sinners that be onely imperfectly contrite, when they are with due disposition baptized, go immediately to Heaven*: Which is a false Doctrine, and no where to be found in the Councils or Fathers, but onely in new Divines.

3. My second note is, that he imposes on us (N. 8.) to say *all the punishments cited against Hereticks by the Councils are miraculous*; Whereas in the very example of David we put part of the punishment *Miraculous*, and part to follow *naturally* from the sin. Where also is to be noted that sweet Argument, that the examples would prove nothing against Hereticks if they were *miraculous*: Whereas it is evident, their proof

is so much the stronger, the more manifest God's hand is in punishing after the sin was forgiven.

4. My third note is that (N. 10.) he would persuade his Reader that we deny *Bodily sufferings are undertaken to satisfy the pains due to God's Justice*, and after he has made an exclamation in the same Paragraph he puts us to affirm that they are to be done for the taking away of passions or ill motions left by sin, and that this is to satisfy for the sin passed: And this himself calleth a weak reply made in our defence; by which he confesses we hold the contrary to what he imposes, and therefore it is injuriously layd upon us; For how weakly soever we defend what we hold, yet assuredly we hold it. As for his oppositions I refer them to their proper place, for they concern not authority.

5. My fourth note then is, that (N. 11.) he explicates the receiving of Baptism *duly*, to be the receiving it *sine fictione*; an explication I never heard before, nor ever was given by good Divine. For, although it be necessary to come *sine fictione* to the effect of receiving Grace, yet to say that this is all that is *due* or *sitting*, or that men should endeavour to have to receive Baptism as they ought, is a Doctrine I have not yet found in any

Casuist;

Casualty; and yet it is a point deeply concerns his discourse as we hereafter shall shew.

6. In his fourteenth Chapter he intends to press the Council of *Florence*; and the decree of *Benedict* the eleventh. It seems therefore the oppositions made by former opponents are judged by him not sufficient; and his friends, indeed seem'd to confess thole were satisfy'd with a threatening of a greater Champion to follow: yet I must take leave to remit my Reader to that Answer when your Divine goes no farther then the Vindicatour. As for your Divine, my first exception is that in his first number he affirmeth that both sides agreed, that what was left to be purged at death might in some time before the day of Judgment be utterly sayd to be now wholly purged, and he adds in Latin, *Purgatum ex toto*. I see it is happy for him that he has a good pair of Spectacles, such as can make him see deep into a Millstone. For I that can see onely the outside, find no such sense in these words. I find nothing in the words cited by him that speaks of *Esse* *Essentie*, as Philosophers term it, but onely of *Esse* *Essentie*, that is, of this consequence: *Those men are purged, what follows: That they go to Heavens, or no.* I never learn'd in Logic,

Logick, that an Interrogatory form was affirmative. Had he sayd that both parties had agreed that this should be the question; I perforce must have submitted; but to make the world believe that he who asks what is to be sayd in such a case, should be supposed to think the case true, is beyond my Logick. But you may reply that it is no great matter, for his Logick may be far beyond mine. Nor can I deny it: Specially if he can make them agreed of what they *never thought of*. For in the same Paragraph he tells us, that *before our unhappy age he finds no mention of any Catholick who denyed such Souls to be deliverable before that day*. He had done me a great pleasure if he had set down what Hereticks before that time had deny'd it: For then we might have gather'd all Catholicks had agreed against those Hereticks. Now the Agreement must be such as was the Solution a School-fellow of mine was wont to give to the difficulties he found in his dictates, which was to forget them. So this Agreement was never to think or motion it, or at most to hold it no way concerning the difficulty then proposed.

7. This I believe is the substance of this whole Chapter. For I see he tosses it and tumbles it in divers expressions, but gets not
a foot

a foot farther. For what he tells us in the next Number, to wit, that this question concerned much the souls in Purgatory is very true, but how he can infer it belongs to the Popes question is what I make difficulty of. For I do not understand the Pope either meant to handle all questions, or any one of Purgatory, or to make an exhortation to pray for the dead by this Definition, but only to declare the efficacy of Grace to carry people to perfect bliss, as is evident by the Popes so much insisting upon the explication of the fullness to which men arrive.

11. In his fourth Number he presses what an intolerable thing it is to keep the souls of one who hath spoken *but one Idle word*, so long not onely from the sight of God, but also in most afflictive punishments, I do not remember I have any where declared that any man was sent to Purgatory for just one Idle word. I think my way teaches that the next world depends on the *habits*, not on the *acts*, otherwise then as they are causes of remaining dispositions in the soul: I do not know also where I have determin'd how far the pangs of death do satisfy for sins, so that I take his supposition to be very aerial; but it is not here place to discuss it. In the mean while I see it was a providence of God that
your

your Divine lived not before our Saviour's Passion, for had he gone to *Limbo*, he would have so mutmured against God for keeping Holy *Abel* so many years out of Heaven for Original sin; which Divines hold to be less then any Venial sin, that it would have troubled the whole company.

9. He seems to press that this will retard men in their progress towards Heaven. But he that were to speak for my opinion, would say *no*, but that it would press them so much the more, to be of that number that shall not be stay'd so long from their desired reward, seeing it is in their own hands to go immediately to Heaven if they will. For the case the Pope speaks of, differs from ours in this, that in his case it was not in the power of the living, to obtain their coming to Heaven, but in our case it is. For Purgatory must needs be a place for tepid people, seeing it is written of Heaven that *Violence doth carry it*.

10. In his fifth Number he tediously repeats the same Argument of pressing the word *esse* to signify *existence*; onely he adds a more silly confirmation. For, where the Pope speaks of all three sorts of souls being in Heaven in common and uses the three tenses *have been, are, and shall be*, he presses that these

These 3 senses must be true of all 3 sorts of souls, whereas any one soul is enough to verify those three senses, seeing who once *has been* in Heaven, *is* there and ever *shall be*: And this, upon no other ground then because it is fit for his purpose. So willfull an Interpreter he is.

11. In his sixth Number he finds a gross Errour in him that shall say the Pope made but one Definition concerning the state of souls departed. What a piece of Divinity is this? It is agreed upon by both sides, what the Pope determines, and in particular there is no disagreement of any point whether it be defined or no; And your Divine finds *a gross Errour* whether it is to be called *one* Definition or *more*. And I take it for so piddling a question, that though the Book ly by me, and to my memory it is sufficiently resolved in former writings, yet I do not think it worth looking the place to see what the resolution and proof is, but onely that it is a great impertinency to count it *a gross Errour* though it should be found to have missed.

12. In the same sixth Number your Divine finds the Popes definition concerning the point in difference in these terms, *That if there shall be any thing to be purged in them, when,*

when, after death they shall be purged, they presently after the aforesaid purgation even before the resurrection of their Bodies, and before the general Judgment, were, are, and shall be in Heaven, have seen and do see God. Now I am so blind that I can find neither good sense nor true English in these. He begins with, if there shall be anything to be purged, and ends with, were, are, and shall be, have seen, and do see. So that in the same proposition the medium is future, and the effect passed. Which is a rare piece of Grammar, and newly invented to make the Popes Definition reach to what the Pope thought not of. Would it not turn a man's stomach to see men so wilfully seek to blind themselves, and others in a question as clear as that two and three make five? Suppose, of those Divines whom the Pope heard in this question, the one held that souls were delivered before the day of Judgment out of Purgatory, and the other as stoutly deny'd it. And the Pope asked them whether at least they agreed in this, that whensoever the souls went out of Purgatory, they went straight to Heaven, and both answered, yes; they both hold that the Pope could not without nonsense tell them he would define that which they both agreed upon, without meddling with the question

question they disagreed in. And, if this be as plain as that two and three make five, if it were the ordinary Rule and proceeding of the Fathers in the Council of *Trent*, as every one may see in the Catholick History of it, is it not pure frowardness and pertinacy in your Divine to spend some four leaves to prove this *Nonsense*? But you may reply for him, that there was no such opposition of Divines. First I ask how he knows it, for he hath cited never a *Diurnal* of what passed about making of the Bull. But suppose there was not, doth what passed a day or a month before, make the Pope's proposition as it lyes to be Sence or Nonsense? And the substance of this answer, by all probability, your Divine had read in *Religion and Reason* pag. 69. since (though without naming it) he often cites it, and yet resolvedly rambles upon other solutions without taking notice of this, which was the main. I would intreat my Reader who shall not be satisfy'd with this, to read the place newly cited, for this Divines *Catching of Larks* and *Pope Joan*, is such stuff as deserves not to be looked into.

13. In his twelfth Number he falls upon the Council of *Florence*, but speaketh nothing of any consequence which hath not been answered: Wherefore I remit the Reader

to

to Religion and Reason, p. 38, 39, 60.

14. N. 13. he turns us back to his fifth Chapter, where he had mention'd *Gennadius*; and the truth is, my answer there was short, and must be still so For, although I am secure that what I there sayd was true, yet I am desirous to see the Book it self before I give a fuller answer; not to your Divine, but to another who before him objected the same Authority a great deal more strongly against me. There remains no more in this Chapter, but to joyn in prayer with your Divine, for the good man who published in English this Bull of Pope *Benedict*, and the Council of *Florence*, that every Judicious man may see who truly stand to their words and meaning; and who do violently strain them against both words and sense.

NINTH

NINTH DIVISION

Containing an Answer to his fifteenth and
sixteenth Chapters.

Universality of Opinions may obliging to Ac-
tually His bold, and weak Challenges. That
the imagin'd Corporeity of Spirits grounded
the Opinion of their Admirability. What
fomented and spread it. A short Account of
J. M's weak performance in this.

HIS fifteenth Chapter carries for
its title. *The Verdict of the Catholick*
world for us. A brave title and I will do him
that right as to testify he follows it hand-
somely. His first Argument is, that, sup-
pose the delivery of souls before Judg-
ment had been but a probable opinion, yet
Universal to all Pastors, Doctors, and lead-
ing Teachers for five hundred years, it
would be far more rational to follow it then
another which should be pretended a De-
monstration, but (for whatsoever the Au-
ditor can tell) may have some horrid Er-
rour ly for a while couched in it, which might
in time be discovered. To this I give two
answers.

2. The

2. The first is, that in Metaphysical rigour of truth, no multitude of men can be so vast, no gravity and wisdom of them so high and great, as to oblige any ingenious man to believe that which themselves profess *they do not know whether it be true or no*. For all Belief is grounded upon the *knowledge* of another. If I be secured he does not know the thing I should believe upon his credit, I have no ground of belief, for upon this point he is a pure *Ignorant*. If you reply, though he do not *know* it to be true, yet he *thinks* so; I must answer that I ought to believe him the less, seeing he is not so honest to himself but that he will cozen himself, by trusting that to which his own conscience telleth him he ought not to trust. Now this is the condition of all those who hold a proposition as *probable*: And therefore, though all the world for five hundred Ages had held the deliverableness of souls out of Purgatory, *onely as probable*, in rigour it made no advantage at all.

3. My second Answer is more accommodated to human practise, and it is taken out of Nature and Experience, out of which *St. Austin* took it. This distinguishes Mankind into two degrees; One that is able fully and properly to judge of a truth proposed
I with

with due proof, and as it should be; The other that either for natural dullness, or for unwillingness to take pains, is not in state to look upon truth in it self, and therefore is fittingly to be governed by Authority. To the former, no multitude nor time can bring obligation to refuse a well proposed Verity as long as the contrary Authority is uncertain: The other ought indeed not to meddle, but if by any necessity he must do beyond his reach, it is clear the greater number ought to oversway with him as far as he is not able to weigh the worth of both sides. By these two Answers you will see the pleading of multitudes of Opinators, will not much advantage your Divines opinion further then amongst them who ought not to meddle in such questions.

4. Although this evidently ruins his Argument, yet I cannot omit to shew another weakness unsufferable for its plainness. For, he adds that *if they had no other witness then of the Latin Church for these last five hundred years, this alone were not to be slighted.* I pray why not? Is not the contrary Testimony of the Greek Church predominant over the Latin, where there is but an opinion of five hundred years on one side, and one thousand five hundred on the other. Nay, put case the

the Greek Church were not against it, considering that the subject is a matter *not otherwise* to be known then by Revelation, were it not intolerable to bind any man to the belief of it *otherwise* then because it is revealed? which if it were but of five hundred years standing were impossible to be: For the Church professes no Revelations for her guide since the Apostles dyed: If then your Divine professed no farther, he must confess it to be a weak and ungrounded Innovation. For, supposing it cannot be known but by Revelation, and that there has been no Revelations these six hundred years, it is clearly wholly ungrounded. And, because the subject is a subject of Revelation, that is, that on their side can have no ground but Revelation, this ungrounded Innovation is in matter of Revelation, and we know onely Faith is the proper matter of Revelation: Their opinion then is a piece of *Faith* as to the *matter*, and should therefore have, but hath no ground of *Revelation*.

5. Your Divine replies that he groundedly challenges also six hundred years before. It is a folly to dispute this Question. He speaks in supposition that he has layd solid grounds: My answers are since made. The two being compared, men of wisdom and

learning are to judge how solid his grounds are to make such a challenge upon. He challenges us to shew one Authour who doth so much as by one Word insinuate that our opinion did grow to be more Universally received in the Church these last five hundred years then before it was. A strange and shameless confidence! Did not *Odilo* make it Universal in the Order of *Cisterciens*? Did not the Pope command the Feast? Did these make no more Universality? See how many Revelations were before those days, and how many since; do all these signify *no more Universality*? And this may serve untill his fourth Number, all before being but the supposition of what he hath not done.

4. In the fourth Number he tells us *it cannot be deny'd but for these five hundred years, all who have pray'd for the dead were instructed by their Ancestours, to pray for the present, either ease, or delivery, of the Dead.* Yet it is deny'd him that their Ancestours taught it them, as likewise it is impossible to prove, and improbable to beleeve, that all were so taught. We know Doctrins that are new, first infect one part, and then another, and so by little and little get a popularity. The reason why it easily attain'd to this, is because the *Corporality* of those substances which we hold

hold to be *spiritual*, was long held in the Church, nor is yet perfectly out. I have heard men learned, as they are generally called, that is of much reading, affirm that there were no simple substances but God, and declare that this was the common opinion of the Fathers. You see this opinion is very conformable to the apprehension of all who are not Metaphysicians: And our opinion depends wholly of the Spirituality of Angels and Souls, the which even those who follow, follow but imperfectly. For the nature of Science is to be attained by pieces and degrees, so that we must not expect that all who hold the Soul and Angels to be *Spirits*, should discourse of them as *pure Spirits* ought to be discoursed on. St. *Thomas* took away proper Locality from them, but is weakly followed, not onely by other Schools which are filled with *Ubications*, but even in his own. Now Immutability which *Aristotle* demonstrated of Spirits, is not as yet accepted any thing commonly: But if once it come to be thoroughly looked into, it will be as well as Illocality, and your Divines opinion of Purgatory as much rejected as the Corporality of Spirits is.

7. To return to our purpose, This apprehension of Corporal Torments, and succes-

sion, and parts in them, being so natural to mans understanding, also the ending of them was naturally apprehended as a thing conformable to the rest, and so all this Doctrin when it began to be superadded to Tradition, was received as conformable to it; men not penetrating the consequences that followed out of the souls being a *Spiris*: And otherwise seeing nothing contrary to Christian Piety, before the excess came to be so great that it grew but a sport to deliver souls out of Purgatory. This began to make men reflect; and abhorring the excess to look into the causes of the mistake, and to find it proceeded hence, that some who ventur'd to meddle with Divinity without sufficiency in Philosophy, in lieu of explicating the Metaphorical words in which Scriptures and Fathers deliver Christian Doctrin, that it may be common to learned and unlearned (the which is the proper duty of a Scholastical Divine) undertake to justify that the Metaphors and Allegories are to be understood according to the very bark of the Letter, and to force the learned to have no other apprehensions then the unlearned have, and so to understand Spiritual things corporeally, and to cry out against them who seek to apply Incorporeal modifications

to Incorporeal Substances. So that the reason of the vulgarity of this opinion, is because *Animale* is before *Spirituale*. For what was deliver'd by the Apostles, was only that *Prayers should be made for the dead*. You may note specially in *St. Austin* and *St. Chrysostom*, that having much occasion to speak of prayer for the dead, they are earnest to report that this could not be unless some good arrived to the dead thereby, but are as careful not to tell any good in particular, for fear of missing in what they had not found sufficient ground in Scripture to declare. Weaker men finding the question started, resolved by the proportion to what they saw in human actions, without reflecting upon what the Conditions of Incorporeal natures required; and upon this apprehension follow'd the multitude of Visions and Revelations to confirm this position, the which being coloured with two gratefull sightfullnesses, *Pity* and *Wonder*, easily got a great strength amongst the meaner sort of learned men, and the multitude of the unlearned.

8. In his fifth Number he presses that the Apostles taught the faithfull *why they should pray for the dead*, and therefore he argues that motive must still remain in the Church.

I answer, the Apostles taught them to pray for the dead to receive their reward *at the day of Judgment*, as is beyond exception plain in St. Pauls prayer for *Onesiphorus*, and abundance of Scripture and Fathers, as may be read in my Treatise of Purgatory, and is still conserved in the Church Offices.

9. In his sixth Number he repeats the pressing of the Bulls so fully answered, and of the cause of the keeping the Holy Commemoration of the dead, and this holds to the end of the Chapter. Onely I must note, himself confesses Number the sixth, that the Popes Decrees are not of the point it self, but of others necessarily connexed with the point. So that, if his discourse do fail him, there is no prohibition, even by his own words of our tenet; and out of what we have said it is easy to see it doth fail him; And by consequence that all the ground they have is but a pious credulity.

10. In his 16 Chapter, and the last of his proving discourse (for afterwards follow the answers to my Grounds) he professes to deliver *the fundamental reason of his opinion*; And I suppose in his first Paragraph he would say (if he did dare speak out) that he had none. Yet not to scandalize his party he must make a shew, and so in the midst of his
 t hird

third Number he saith our opinion is *Paradoxical*, which is all the reason I can find. And as for that I must remit him untill we explicate our opinion, which will not now be far of. For, the rest of this Chapter he spends in saying his Doctrin is conformable to the Councils of *Trent* and *Florence*, and to St. *Austin*, all which I confess, for they speak but of Purgatory in common, and so both our opinions are conformable unto them; our difference being onely a *particularity* of Purgatory, and not about the *sence* of it.

II. Here if it please you to cast an eye upon what is passed, you will find his first proofs to be out of Scriptures, speaking Doctrins common to us both, the second out of Fathers, who say Christ at his Resurrection deliver'd souls out of Purgatory; which we grant. His next from Fathers who are known to have fallen into Errours in the points he cites them for, that is, he cites three Heresies for himself. In the fourth place Revelations out of *Greg. Turonensis* and *Metaphrastes*, insufficient Authours. Fifthly some Fathers and Councils who speak no more then what both sides agree of: Later Revelations enow, but they are such Testimonies as are insufficient (I think even in his own judg-

judgment, to make a Theological proof. Two Bulls of Popes, whereof the one is grossly mistaken. And lastly, a false apprehension of the Churches present devotions; which he takes not out of publick Prayer-Books, but out of private intentions. These are the most substantial passages of his discourse; others of less moment I neglect, not to make my period too tedious.

SECOND

SECOND PART.

*Maintaining the Arguments brought
by the Authour from Authority
and Reason for the Doctrin of the
Middle State.*

FIRST DIVISION.

Containing preparatory Grounds for the
ensuing discourses.

*That God being All-wise and Self-Blessed,
acts onely for the Good of his Creatures, and
especially Man, what God's Honour signi-
fies, and how he governs Man. The Nature
of Sin, and its Effects. How God's Justice
is satisfy'd. Of Merit, Impetration and
Satisfallion. A Breviate of the Adversar-
ry's opinion.*

I. **B**Efore I begin to look into his Im-
pugnations of my Doctrin, I think
it expedient to lay down a brief
explication of mine own thoughts in this que-
stion, intreating my Reader's patience, if he
thinks I fetch it too far about; whereof he
will

will see the necessity hereafter. I settle therefore, or rather explicate, some Principles, necessary to the seeing how intimately my Doctrine is connexed with Christian Faith.

2. Let the first be, that God is Essentially *wise* and *wisdom*, or *Truth*, or true Understanding of his actions and the Government of them. For if any man sees what he should do, but by passion, or rather distraction doth not what he sees should be done, we may call him *Understanding* or *Knowing*, but not *wise*. Therefore God whose Essence it is to be *wisdom*, cannot swerve from what he sees to be done, or best to be done: For it is all one to him who is governed purely by *Wisdom*, to be *best to be done*, and to *be to be done*; because nothing but *true Good* can move such a Will; and, betwixt two unequal goods, the greater is onely the true Good.

3. My second Principle is that God is essentially *Bliss* and *Blessed*; and that in so high and pure a degree, that no Good which is adventitious from either his own action, or the action of any other Substance, can be wanting to him, or desirable by him: and because *Good* signifies *desirable*, that there is no extrinsecal good that can truly challenge the denomination of a *Good* to God. Honour
for

for example is the Good of a Man upon two scores; one, because when he hears himself commended, he hath an act of pleasure which perfects him intrinsically; the other, because Honour brings him help to do somewhat which perfects him; for example, to get Wealth or some Office, out of which he can gather *contentment*: So that still the interior contentment is that which makes the exterior instruments to have the name of *Goods*. Wherefore seeing Christian Religion teaches us that God gets no *new contentments* out of the effects his action has, it is also necessary to believe, the honour that all Saints give him is no Good of his.

4. Out of these two follows the Third; that, whatsoever God does, he does it for the Good of his Creatures; and that, when he says that he acts for his own Honour, the meaning is, that he works that other men (whom the Action toucheth not) seeing those he acts upon well governed, may be bettered and praise him, and conceive a greater apprehension of his wisdom and goodness, and by that means the good of his whole Mass of Creatures be perfected. So that the Honour he speaks of, is nothing but the well ordering of his Creatures; in which one principal and main part is, that his rational

onal

onal creatures have Faith, Hope, and Charity, which are all parts of praising him. So that we are not to look for a farther end of God's works, then the perfection which is intrinsecal to the Universal Mass of his Creatures.

5. The fourth is consequent to these; to wit, that seeing the Good of his Creatures is his main end, and the Good of a Creature is that which is *desirable* to that Creature, and every Nature desires its own Perfection, and that perfects Nature which makes it able to do those actions to which such a nature is instrumental (or for which such a Nature is made) in perfection: It follows, that if we consider the whole Mass of Creatures, God's action is still that which is most conformable unto it, or to the Nature of *all Creatures*. But, if we consider a particular Nature upon which God acts, God's action is that which is most conformable to such a Nature, as being in such a posture of Nature in common, or the best to this particular Nature, as far as it stands with the greatest good of the general Mass. Whence it is evident that God never did nor will do any thing but conformably to the Nature of Creatures. And this you see evidently out of the Attributes of his *Wisdom* and

and *Self-sufficiency*, which are main Articles of Christian Faith.

6. The fifth Principle is that because Man is the end of all material Creatures, and Man is to be governed by his own Understanding, it is necessary that some things or actions be so done, that the effects be not onely performed, but that they may be *persuasive* to man. Further, because Mankind is of a short apprehension, and subject to follow his senses, whereas his Beatitude and chief Good is beyond his reach; Therefore it is necessary God should be the Teacher of Mankind, and speak immediately to him in words and Doctrine, as he did to *Adam*, *Moyse*, and the Apostles: and that they should know that the words spoken were from God; and therefore some extraordinary actions which are above the power of those natural causes with which we are familiar, should be in convenient occasions exhibited; out of which it should be known that a higher hand gave Testimony to the words and Doctrines delivered. The special conveniences which require such actions God alone knows, but it seems rational to think, that a very private good cannot exact them, but onely such which either singly or in multitude concur to a Publick Good. Other circumstances

in

which prayers made by Faith may require to be heard, may be supply'd by the subtle twisting of causes by the Divine providence, unpenetrable by us, which fulfill the desires of weak Persons who with great Faith demand the help of God. Howsoever, this is the main Principle, that God never does such actions but when they are to be *known*, and to govern men by *perswasion*. Out of which it follows, That whensoever such Actions have not connatural ways to be known and manifested, they ought not to be supposed to be done, but that God proceeds according to the course of natural second causes. Nor must it be omitted that even in these miraculous Actions, God proceeds more according to Nature in general then in the others. For, this being the main point of Nature to bring Man to Bliss conformably to his nature, that is by the way of *Perswasion*, what is most conformable to Perswasion, is most conformable to the chief part of Nature, that is to Mankind in the greatest effect, which is in ordering him immediately to Bliss.

7. Hitherto my Principles have been somewhat abstracted, yet necessary to be known and taken purely, either out offaith, or out of evident and confessed natural Truths concerning man's nature. The following Principles

ciples will be more close to our subject.

8. The sixth therefore is that a Sin is an action against Reason; that is, against the Nature of Man, and therefore hurtfull to him, first in soul, the which it most principally corrupts; next in Body, both according to his internal faculties, and many times also in his external and vegetative qualities. Thirdly, if it be an external act, it prejudices Man-kind, that is, his Neighbours; either in their souls by Scandal, and evil Example; or also in their Bodies or Fortunes. And out of these Considerations, the Sinner remains subject to Satisfaction towards himself, (which consisteth in the reparation of the damages done to himself) towards the Church, and towards the civil Government. As for the damages of his Soul, if he repairs them not with penance and good works, he goeth thorough the violence of his affection sinfull into the next world; and there suffers the sorrows and contradictions which follow distracted affections. As for the damages of his inward Bodily powers, those breed in him, or increase in him, either more sinfull actions, or at least greater strife betwixt the rational and the material part; and, if they be not remedied in this world, cause the disposition of the parting soul to be

be worse and imperfecter then it should be, and so subject to ill effects in the next world. As for the other damages to himself or his Neighbours, unless he hath the will to repair them, he doth not quit the sin, as is manifest in the case of Restitution: But, if he do what lyes in his power, and truly is not negligent, they hurt him not in the next world: But all Negligence and Tepidity is carry'd into the next World, in quality of a sinfull disposition, and so accrues to the punishment due to the sin.

9. The seventh Principle is, that by Gods order all the evils which follow sin either by its proper nature, or by the orders of Ecclesiastical and Civil Government, are ordained by God to be punishments of that sin; and therefore whosoever by way of penance doth prevent the punishments which other ways would fall upon him by this order of God, doth plainly extinguish the due-ness of the pains; as *St. Zaccarius* when he payd four double of all that he had wronged any man, quitted the score of what he had offended human nature civilly: He that did willingly undergo the Penitential Canons, or like a Holy *Mary Magdalene*, or *Mary the Egyptian*, did retire to a voluntary penance, did satisfy the Church; And those who

who have perfect Contrition, satisfy for all the defects of the soul and her interior powers in the body. I find it is a clear case, that he who leaveth nothing due to any of these parties, hath satisfy'd for all the pains they can exact of him.

10. The eighth Principle is, that Gods Justice may be taken either for the vertue of Justice in himself, or for the effect it hath in its creatures. If it be taken for this latter, it consists in this that every creature hath that which is fitting to him, in respect of its proportion to the rest of the world, and its situation and order in it. Therefore it is clear, that he who satisfies for his sins as it is explicated in the former Principle, doth absolutely satisfy Gods Justice in this sence. But, if you take Gods Justice, as Justice signifies a vertue in him; then *to satisfy Gods Justice* adds to the former explication, that the satisfaction the man does, is that which God by the vertue of Justice exacts to have done; the which because it is that which the repentant sinner has done, it is clear that the sinner hath satisfy'd God also in that sence.

11. The ninth Principle is, that all and every good act done in state of Grace, and proceeding from Charity, is *meritorious*; that is, deserves a *reward*. And the Reward

may be the extrinsecal or intrinsecal good of the actor; that is, either a good to his own Person or to his Friends. For who does an act of Charity increases Charity in himself, and becometh more Holy then he was before, and therefore a greater and better member of Gods Church: And, because we know that all things (as the Apostle teaches) be made for the Elect, and do cooperate to their good, we know that they are more made, and do more cooperate, to the good of them who are more just and more Saints. Hence it comes that God orders by his ordinary Providence (for it is not an infallible rule) that the friends of the just man fare better, because he is just; and and so the just man by being just, merits, not onely for his own Person, but also for others. Again, because God doth this in respect of the desire of the just Person, whether that desire be actual, or onely in preparation of heart, this which we call *meriting*, is also obtaining or *impetrating*: And, because what is merited or impetrated, may be either addition of good, or diminution of evils; when it is diminution of evils, it is called *Satisfaction*: Wherefore the same Action by the same vertue is *meritorious*, *impetratory*, and *satisfactory*. I know some scruple at saying one

One man can deserve for another, taking that to be the property of Christ: but I see the Fathers use the word merit freely in this sense, and therefore I do not scruple to do the same. Wherefore I do not put these three Words to signify three Qualities of the Action, but one quality according as it is related to divers Causes or Effects.

12. Hitherto you have read the explication and deduction of my opinion, and I do not think my Adversary will quarrel at much of this; not that I think them to be his opinions, but because partly he knows them to be the opinions of other Divines, and partly they are so rational that any sensible man will condemn him at first sight. Now therefore it is time to lay down the Adversary's opinion as I apprehend it, leaving him all liberty to explicate himself in what I shall misin, at his own pleasure.

13. You must know therefore, that the Scriptures preach the Doctrine I have lay'd down minutely and Philosophically, in few and Metaphorical terms. They represent you God like a Man-Law-giver, tell you that he hath lay'd up fire for those who will not obey, in the next world. My Adversaries take this as a word and a blow, and conceive that Sin is an Action to which punish-

ment is due of its own nature, and that God should not be just if he did not bestow it on the sinner; so that they put the relation between sin and punishment, and both them to God: nor will they hear that this follows out of the Order of Causes, which are set for the carrying of Man-kind to Heaven, that there may be a proportion *natural* of the sin and punishment; but that God appoints what punishment he thinks best. After this, they put that the three conditions or names of the Vertue of every Action, be three divers Vertues or Qualities, whereof one concerns not the other, or at least may be separable. So that the Action may be *meritorious*, and yet neither *impetrate* nor *satisfy*; likewise, may be *impetrative*, but not *satisfactory*; and may be *satisfactory* without *impetration* or *merit*: And hence they say, some Saints have had Actions both *meritorious* and *impetrative* that *satisfy'd* for nothing or little; because they owed little, or little pains were due to their offences: Whence it comes that there be great heaps of Actions as they are *satisfactory*, lay'd up in the Treasure of the Church, and that the Pope hath the power to take what quantity seems to him fitting, and to present it to God for the sins of living or dead

dead, and that he is bound to accept of it for the debts or pains of such men or souls; whereas my saying is, that the abundance of the merits of Christ, and the Saints give the Church and the Pope all power and vertue to relaxe sins and punishments alwaies that are for the Churches good. This I understand to be the substance of their opinion And now the Reader may be prepared to understand what shall be sayd on both sides.

K 4 SECOND.

SECOND DIVISION,

Containing an Answer to his seventeenth Chapter.

That we agree with others in the Torment, and disagree onely in the Instrument; Ours, more connatural and fit. His self-contradiction, and false imposing of unheld Doctrin. When Baptism remits all pains; and how a soul in Purgatory purgeth her self, Several petty mistakes. No place for merit in the next world. That souls in Purgatory are Saints, and may be pray'd to. The effect of those Prayers which acceterate the day of Judgment. Divers intolerable errors and weakneses in Divinity.

1. **I**N his seventeenth Chapter he professes **I** to shew my Principles to be ill grounded, and that there are *bad sequels* following from them. And if that *shewing* signify no more then *saying*, so I beleevfully he will do what he promises, but if it be taken for *proving*, I doubt he will fall very short of his Title. The reason of my suspicion is, because I find it so, as far as I have hitherto look'd.

look d. For example, the first Principle of mine he makes, that the venial affections which mens souls carry into the next world, are cause to them of great griefs and torments of mind; he farther says, I put *no other torments* in Purgatory but *the grief of this affection* being joyned to the soul, and *the privation of bliss*. And I tell him on the other side, that he puts no torments in Purgatory, but that I put the very same. I confess this proposition is a very bold one, for I know not how absurdly he may talk of those pains; but in hope he speaks as commonly his fellows do, I venture upon this affirmation.

2. To make which good, I distinguish between the Torment, and the Instrument of the torment; as to say *Burning* is the torment, *Fire* the instrument by which the torment is inflicted. And then I make this discourse. Let him look into the ordinary explication of Divines, and see whether they put in Purgatory any other torments then *Acts of the will* which they call *griefs*: Now the question being of souls in Purgatory, that is, holy Souls, I cannot imagin they will put them to be of other objects then such as deserve grief, as of their sins, of the want of Clory, and such like. Now all these I put in the souls of Purgatory; It is clear then, that

then, that I put the same torments in Purgatory that he doth, not one excepted. The difference then is onely that I do not put the same Instruments of torment which he does, but I put *unnatural* Instruments, he *strange* and forced Instruments: I the nature and eminency of a spirit, he a dead body, which cannot be imagin'd how it can hurt a soul. Ask which is the *stronger* Agent, and *fitter* to torment the soul; it is clear that her own nature is infinitely more *strong*, infinitely more *fit*. Why then doth not my way satisfy him? Because he does not understand that the words of the Scripture are *Metaphorical*; because he understands not what signifies *Gods Justice*: because the Bells ring in his ears that the Councils signify other punishments then their words express. He vaunts the Councils be against us, but when he declares them, he cannot find one word beyond what is common to both opinions.

3. In his third and fourth Number he would perswade his Reader that we fall into his own Errour of *denying Purgatory*, because we say these purging torments end not until the day of Judgment; and hath not so much reflexion as to remember that there is no place for Purgatory when purging is done: As long as we profess *Purgatory*, we must profess

profess not purged. This is the Doctrin perpetually before his eyes in the Council of Florence and Pope Benedict, and he looks so a squint that he cannot see what is plainly before him, that as soon as purging is turned to purged the soul is in bliss. About what then doth he quarrel with me? because I say the ill affection is in Purgatory all the while the soul is there: and yet he says the same. Let him reflect upon these his own words, N. 4. *Whereas Purging cleaving, &c. signifies the taking away of something which contains the nature of a stain or blemish.* If this be so, then clearly something containing the nature of a stain or blemish is in the soul as long as the soul is in Purgatory. Then he unjustly accuses me of saying this which himself is fain to confess, and I think against his own opinion, who puts (if I am not mistaken) no stain or blemish in the souls of Purgatory, and therefore no purging nor Purgatory: and so all the Fathers he repeats anew be plainly against himself.

In his fifth Number he imposes a new falsity upon me, to wit, that I say the souls at the day of Judgment piteously burn in their Bodies, but that that fire purgeth nothing that can be called sin. I wonder where he found this imagination. For my Doctrin is that the fire
of

of Judgment is ministerial to the Angels, framing the Bodies to Resurrection, and by this precedent service is instrumental cause of what is done in the instant of Reunion and Resurrection, & in that instant all the Action of fire ceases, and is turned into the *Purgatum esse*, which *Purgatum esse* is the sight of Christ and God, in the very first instant of Reunion. And this Doctrin may he find in my second tome of *Inspiraciones sacra*, pag. 244. and, in my book *De medio statu* by pieces here and there. So that all this good mans discourse is built upon a fancy of his own, and touches not my Doctrin.

6. In his sixth Number he argues from the difference betwixt *Baptism* and *Penance*, that the one takes away all the punishment due to sin, the other leaves some punishment to be expiated by satisfaction: And puts the case of an old man who comes to Baptism after a wicked long life with an imperfect sorrow and disposition; yet says he, all the punishment is remitted to him though there remains many vicious inclinations in him: Now if this man dyes soon after with some small Venial sin, he shall ly in great torments untill the day of Judgment according to my Doctrin;
This

This is his Argument, which he repeats now the second time, and therefore it requires an answer. I tell him therefore that it is very true, that *Baptism* being taken with a fitting disposition to the nature of the Sacrament, remits all pains, and the Sacrament of *Penance* does not, as is plain, seeing Satisfaction is one part of this Sacrament: But I would gladly know, by what Authority your Divine changeth the Councils Definition, and that which the Council speaks of men coming to Baptism with a disposition conformable and proportionable to the nature of the Sacrament, he enlarges it to them who come with an imperfect and unproportionable disposition. All men know Baptism is a Regeneration in which we are made *nova creatura*, in which our *Vetus Homo* is buried; And therefore the connatural disposition is that a man come with a resolution of a perfect change of life, such an one as we see in St. *Austin* at his conversion, which made him feel no more tentations of his former imperfections; such as we acknowledge in people perfectly contrite; such as is supposed to be in men who relinquish the world to be *Carthusians*, *Eremites*, *Anachorites*, &c. in all which we acknowledge that their repentance cancels all pains; but likewise we acknowledge

ledge it takes away all inclination to former Vices, at least out of the spiritual part of men; and so leaves no matter for the fire of Purgatory to work upon, which burneth onely ill affections.

7. In his seventh Number, he cries out against this Principle, that the Soul, now become a pure Spirit, should retain her Affections to Bodily Objects, and thinks this misbecomes a Philosopher to say; therefore I think my best play is to say, I speak as a Divine: For I hope so to have the protection of all those, who say, that in Hell the Souls are unrepentant; and obstinate in their sins, and sinful desires. Nevertheless, if he will needs appeal to Philosophy, let him consider what *Plato* to. de Rep. What *Cebes*; what the *Pythagoreans* teach, and *Virgil*, out of Philosophers.

Conjux ubi pristinus illi

Respondet curis, equasque Sicbens amorem.

And again; — *Qua gratia curram,*

Armorumque fuit vivis, qua cura nitentes,

Pascere equos, eadem sequitur tellure repostus.

But let us see what he objects against this received Doctrine of Divines, and Philosophers. Is, saith he, such a Soul purging her self? I answer; Yes, forsooth: I pray, if you ever looked into the strife betwixt the Spirit,

Spirit, and the Flesh, either how a man purgeth himself in his whole life, or in some great Battail, and Pitch'd-Field, see whether both are not compounded of vicissitudinary Victories, now of the Spirit, now of the Flesh. Reflecting now, that the eminency of the separated Soul, contains in it self, at once, more then the whole life-time of an incorporated Soul; what must, or can we think, but that all this contradiction of Wills, must be at once in an imperfect separated Soul? which is, in our life, in parts, and separated in time.

8. He says again Philosophy teaches him, that *no body loves evil, clearly apprehended to be evil, & that no disguise of good can cheat a separated Soul.* I must confess both these Propositions to be true, and therefore I am forced to say, that in Purgatory their love is not about evil objects, but truly good, and conformable to Nature, and their fault consists onely in *excess of love*, which makes them apt to follow their objects, where, and when they should not.

9. His third Objection is, *How we know the Soul will embrace this wilfulness, since it is voluntary, and therefore, in her liberty, not to accept of it, or chuse it.* This Objection hath two faults; the one, that it doth not

not distinguish betwixt *Voluntary*, and *Free*, their own Philosophy teaching them, that the love of our last End, or good, in common, is a *voluntary* act, but not *free*. The like they teach of the accepting of a *medium*, when there is but one to gain the fore-embraced *End*. The other is, that he thinks that this wilfulness begins at Death, whereas it doth but continue, and began in the Body. As the very words of *remaining*, and being *conserved*, do signifie.

10. His last Objection is, that there is in Purgatory, an *effoacious repentance*, and therefore no will to do the like again. I answer, this word *repentance* doth stick in my stomach: for if it means onely an act of a contrary affection, I easily accord it to him; for in this consists the torment of a Soul, that is vitious either in this World, or in the next; that she has contrary Affections in her self, one fighting against the other: for the general inclination to her last Good, can never be rooted out, and no Vice can be, but contrary to this inclination. But if Repentance be taken for the revoking, cancelling, or blotting out of the unlawful desire; I doubt it would prove an *Hereſie*, to put that, and that the Soul shall remain in Purgatory; for then she would have *no blemish* in her.

11. In his eighth Number he prosecutes the same, but against all Divinity, and himself. For whereas he puts that after this life there is no place for merit, he will here needs make an act of Charity not begun in the Man's life, but in the first instant of his great knowledge of the next World, enough to make such a weak one as I am worse than an Origenist: For I know not why, by his Argument, any body should be damn'd, or rather could be damn'd; for, questionless, every Soul, whatsoever it be, hath, at her separation, so clear an understanding of the goodness of God, and the variety of all corporal goods, that if there were then place of Repentance, and making of new an act of Charity, she could not chuse but cancel all her idle desires, and turn to God. For, if there be Repentance, it may be as well in the choice of her chief good, as of the ways to it. But whence shall we know the good Thief was *violently set upon his evil courses*? For my good Nature inclined me to think, he had been for want or ill company, brought into inconvenience: But seeing it is fitting for the Divine's Argument, let it pass; what will follow? That if he repented in this life, there is place of Repentance in the next, for all that have a perfecter

L

know;

knowledge of God's Goodness, and their own Folly?

12. His ninth Number sheweth a great fear, that some in Purgatory may be honoured for Saints. But what if they were? Are not they *God's Friends*? Are they not truly *Saints*? Why then should the Church erre in declaring them so? But that he may not be afraid, I would desire him to believe, until he gains knowledg, that it is the *Habits*, gotten in this life, and not the *acts* which make Saints. For the Acts pass, but the Habits remain, and bnd into Affections of their own Nature in the next life; So that if his Saints have no evil *Habits*, the obreption of an *act* will do them no harm; besides, that the anguishes of Death have verue in such men to purge sleight sins. As for his Stories, he will understand that I am more a Lover of good ones, then a Creditor of unlikely ones; as of that out of St. *Peter Damian*, concerning Saint *Severinus*; for I cannot judge his act to have been irrational, as far as you recount it. The Story also of *Paschasius*, I beleve, is of no better credit then of *Baronius*, who was, as I take it, the last Correctour of the *Roman Martyrologe*, and gave more credit to the *Dialogues*, called St. *Gregories*, then I do.

13. Now

13. Now are we arrived to the tenth Number, in which he puts a Second Principle of mine, though you will find, in effect, it is the same with the former; or, at least, so joyn'd with it, that he hath already impugn'd it. Yet that is nothing to me, so he brings new matter. That which most terrifies me, is, that he threatens, after he has done with it here, he will make a new Chapter of it: So desirous are People of making great Books, though it be with the tedious repetition of the same thing ten times over. But (says he) this Point is attended with so long a train of absurdities, that *one Chapter will not serve*, and so *one* must be largely prosecuted in this Chapter. The Principle is, *that what affections the Soul embraces at her separation, she persists in the same the whole time of her separation.* His inconvenience he finds in this Doctrine is, that he must find some present allwagement of the pains in Purgatory, when the Prayers are made for the Dead: And repeats over the Authours he cited before to that purpose, whereof the Devil in the *Scul*, and *Metaphrastes*, a Tale-finder, are to his purpose; All the rest speak but what we will hold as well as he, yet must be plain for him. Onely I must note, that he changes the for-

mer Text he cited out of St. *Isidore* into paying part of the pain. I must desire him to look well into his Books, and see whether his own Fellows teach the Doctrin which here he presseth, to wit, that at *that very time* when a Mass is sayd, or an Alms is given, there be some relaxation of pain given; as his fine Stories relate. For I know the ordinary way is of delivering Souls, or, at least, of the shortning the time of the Souls punishments; whereas present Refreshments would rather make the pains longer, and the delay of Heaven greater, which would be worse to the Souls in Purgatory, then to be without such relief and so by the greatness of the pain to make the time shorter: therefore if there be not a perfect release, the comfort should stay until the end may come, with, or by it. Another quaint conceit is, that all the above-used Authorities, makes relief flow from the pious acts *effellively*. Truly this is to be a great Divine. The Authorities, all that are esteemable say, that *good Prayers and works help the Dead*, and we agree with this saying; But it is necessary for him, that it be *presently* done, and immediatly these very words no whit changed signify, that it is *presently* done.

14. This is not enough for him, but he requires that the Prayers should do them *effectively*, and, upon his least beck, the words ply themselves to signify an *effective causality*. Is not this strong Divinity, to make the words of Councils, and Fathers, so pliable to his Will, that without any change, they signify what he pleases? What would not *Simon Magnus* have given, to have had the Holy Ghost so in a string? He objects that the relief of Souls is *certain*, and must not be made depend of the *probable opinion* that *Souls know future things*? Where should I have learned this Divinity, if I had not met with it here? I might have read all *Suarez*, and *Vasquez* over, and have found all the Mysteries of our Faith explicated by probable Opinions, of which they dissent among themselves, without ever understanding that therefore the mysteries depend of those Opinions. But hereafter I must be waryer, and know that *probable Opinions* are not to be employed in that kind; and therefore I pray let him think I hold it for *certain* that separated Souls know future things, as we have an example of *Samuel*, *Moses*, and of *Onias*, and *Hieremias*. He cites next the Author of the Supplement at the end of *Saint Thomas* his Sum: which Work hath not the

Authority of Saint *Thomas*, no not when the Authour uses the very words of St. *Thomas*. For St. *Thomas* having in his Sum much change of his Doctrin in his other Works, the Sum is the absolute Work, which beareth the authority of St. *Thomas*; the other Works as far as they disagree not with the Sum, are confirmations of it, or consequent to it. Which I mark, because this Divine freely useth the name of St. *Thomas* when he cites this Work; whereas in truth what is in the Supplement must first be proved to be St. *Thomas* his Doctrin, at least in other Books, before it can be father'd upon him. For the very name of Supplement shews the credit of the Doctrin, to depend from an Authour of less esteem then St. *Thomas*; though I do not deny, that ordinarily the Doctrin of the Book is, or was, St. *Thomas*'s Doctrin in his younger days.

15. And now we are brought on to the twelfth Number, in which he advances a difficulty which is truly Theological, and deserves to be discussed. But whereas it hath two parts, that part which is chief, and should go fore-most, he leaves to be discussed in his 22. Chapter; to wit, Whether continuance of an indivisible Entity makes it greater or no: Wherefore here I must
only

only treat the second part, which is, what good Prayers do, which do but *accelerate* the Day of Judgment. And to do this, I must explicate a Doctrine, whereof he should not be ignorant, yet I perceive he is. I lay forth therefore this Proposition, No Prayer is heard by God Almighty for any particular effect, but for such as are fore-determin'd by God, not only to be, but so to be by this Prayer. //

Another I add to this of the same quality, to wit, that no effect which God hath fore-determin'd to be for such a Prayer, can be, if the prayer be not. //

These two Propositions, as peradventure to the ordinary sort of Faithful may be unknown, or rather unreflected on, so is it a shame that any Divine should doubt or question them. As for the former, he that will maintain the contrary, must say God fore-saw not what he would after do, or fore-would not what he after did, which are both notorious Blasphemies.

And he who opposes the later Proposition, must say that some cause which God hath order'd to be the cause of an effect, is superfluous, and hath no influence into the effect, since the effect can be without such a cause, which is no less a derogation to God's Wisdom, and the perfection of his ways. Out of these two Propositions it follows evident-

ly, that if God hath order'd the Day of Judgment to come by the prayers for the Dead, the Day of Judgment would not, nor could not come, unless those prayers were sayd. And, if this be evidently true, it is an evident want of Divinity, to ask what good the prayers for the Dead do, if the Dead receive no other profit, then the advancement of the Day of Judgment? Against this Doctrin, Number 17. he objecteth, What then shall become of Christ's Promises? This is a good Objection for a *Catechumen* who learns Christian Doctrin, but a poor one for a Divine, who should know that Christ governs the World, not, as *Aristotle* puts, in common, by moving the first *Mobile*, but as Faith teaches, by fore-seeing, fore-willing, and ordering every particular act of Angels, Men, and irrational Creatures; and, as far as the acts have any good in them, setting and settling the whole Frame of the Causes inerrantly: So that Christ's Promises rely upon this, not onely power or fore-sight, but (as I may so speak) a kind of fore-acting in his Providence, all the good Creatures shall ever do. Therefore it is silly to talk so, as if Christ's Promises would fail if this particular man did not say this particular prayer, for it proceeds

ceeds upon the actual ordering of this prayer. The like, or weaker, is the Objection, that Christ's Judicative Power will depend of particular prayers; First, because in some way of speaking, it is evidently true, as it is that Christ could not damn *Judas*, if *Judas* were not, or had not betrayed him. Another way, and that in a proper manner of speaking, is, that it doth not follow, that Christ's Judiciary Power dependeth from these prayers, but these prayers of it; For, seeing no body doubts, but that Christ hath in his power what acts shall be, and what shall not, it is clear, that what shall be, depends of him, not He from what shall be: So that this, which with his great Divinity he deems the worst of shifts, is as certain as any Article of our Faith, and *Blasphemous* and *Heretical* to deny.

16. To justify this proceeding of his, he brings another piece of sweet Divinity. It is, that there be some things which God resolves shall come to pass by certain prayers, and some, that he resolves to effect quite independently of any such means, upon other motives. To give you his true meaning in this distinction, is hard: yet I think his meaning is, that the means or causes of some effects are such, that though *de facto* they are

are causes of the effect, yet God would have done the effect, if these causes had fail'd; and other causes are such, that if these causes had fail'd, God would not secure the effect; that is, his meaning is, that some causes which are truly causes, notwithstanding God's Providence that they should be causes, might have fail'd, and therefore God had call'd, if these causes should fail, to provide others which should supply, that the effect might not fail, *Quantum capio, quantum sapio*, what is this, but to put that God's Providence, as far as concerns that this prayer should be, or should be cause of this effect, is fallible, and not certain? Are, we there great Divine, that you tell us God's Providence is *errable*? That neither by his Power, nor by his Wisdom, he can ascertain that which he orders to be done? Or, if peradventure you will not venter to deny his Power, at least that his act falls short? That some good Action is done, which he did not will efficaciously should be done? Is this Catholick, or Christian, either Divinity, or Metaphysicks, to make God's Providences fallible, to make the Essential Wisdom doubtful of what he is to do? casting about like a man, *If this day will not do, I will take another*; O pitiful stuff! O three half-penny Divinity!

17. He objects it were superfluous to pray that *St. Francis* be not turned out of Heaven, because God is resolved not to do it whether any body prays for it or no? What ill luck have I to meet with such Counsellours of God Almighty, who know upon what motives he doth all his Works, and what things must be wanting to break God's intentions? I am bred simply to believe, that if the least dust or straw in the streets should not fall, or be cut, when it does fall and is cut, it would change the greatest effects of God's Providence; So exact be the Rules of God's fore-sight, so just and fitting all that he determines. To us is revealed, what is fitting to promote the saving of our Souls; that is, as concerning our purpose, to pray for those things, the solicitude of which stirs us up to pray heartily and willingly, and therefore it is revealed to us that we ought to pray for the *Dead*, because it causes in us a fervent and great recourse to God. It is not revealed to us, to pray that *St. Francis* should possess his bliss eternally, because that motive of prayer would either be of small efficacy, or have other inconveniences annexed. And yet I do not doubt but this, amongst the rest, may be an effect even of the prayers we say for other

other motives. And conformable to this we ought to understand that rule, *that it is an injury to a Martyr to pray for him*; to wit, as we pray for other Dead, or for remission of his sins. But that we may not joyn our prayers with theirs, for the glorification of their Bodies, I do not know. Their prayer is recorded in the *Apocalyps*; and the Answer, that they must expect until the number of their Brethren be filled up. Nor do I see how we can leave praying for them, as long as we say, *Thy will be done*; for in that we pray for all things which we know to be God's Will that they shall be done. And I fear 'tis onely a blind Reverence, not any knowledg in Divinity which keeps him from quarrelling with the Church, as doing a superfluous action when she prays in the third *Secreta* of the Sunday Mass in Lent, *ut omnium fidelium nomina beata predestinatus liber adscripta retineat.*

18. Out of what is hitherto discoursed it is evident, that to accelerate the Day of Judgment, is to cause it, and all the good that shall be there done to any body, and that therefore it cannot be question'd but that it is a great good. But he presses the term of *Acceleration*, and I must give account why we use that term; which is, be-
cause

cause we find it to be Christ's own word. He told us that *propter electas breuiabuntur dies illi*. And, though he spake literally only of the time of Antichrist, yet we know all the rest hath proportion and Analogy to that. What good is it which the Elect gain by this *shortning* of those days? What, but to be saved? This same good get the Souls in Purgatory, their Beatitude. But your Divine's Fancy is so fixed upon their pains, to have them decrease, or increase by time, that he cannot think of the substantial change from Pains to Bliss. The which if he did consider, he would not tell us Christ did no considerable favour in delivering the *Fathers out of Limbo*; He would not tell us *he that had more prayers got no more than he who had fewer*; unless he imagins prayers can get no other good then *the relaxation of pain*. If in this World prayers can get all sorts of goods, can it get nothing in the next World? Do not the Saints tell us, that prayers accompany Souls to the Tribunal of God? that there they bring respect to the Person? How this is to be understood is another question. Two things are certain, One that this is another thing then *releasing from pains*; the other, that these prayers make *his reward the greater*. All therefore your
Di-

Divines Arguments, that he who hath no prayers shall have as much as he that hath many, mis of their aym. For in the *payment* comes the difference, and your Divine cannot cast his eye once upon that, his heart is so frighted with the pains. By this you easily see, that the apprehension of this good from the first instant in Purgatory, must needs be a lessening of their pains in Purgatory. For we do not esteem the Doctrin he learned from the Devil, that it is just when the prayers are saying or said. And, though our Divine's discourses, that then they begin to have efficacy, is conformable to the Nature of the *Prayers*, it is not to the Nature of the *Souls* which are to be helped; which also is to be respected. As for the Fathers, they must be inched out by his good Translations or Explications, or else they will not come home, but favour our opinion.

19. The first part of the proposed difficulty we delay until the 22. Chapter, in expectation of a fuller account. The later we find chiefly to be grounded on one Errour, and one Carelesnes. The Errour, that he makes God's Providence uncertain, irresolute, and, depending on, not making the comportment of the Creatures. The Carelesnes, that he wholly neglects the good gotten

ten by prayers at the Resurrection, which has it's effect in the whole state of Purgatory; fixing his discourse onely upon that which is so good; So that of this Principle he hath no more to say now, then that he saith that to put the acceleration of the Day of Judgment to be the fruit of the prayer for the Dead, is an unheard novelty. And I conceit it to be the chief fruit of all our prayers commanded in our Lord's Prayer, containing our final Beatitude, which should be our greatest, if not our onely prayer. He adds, it will make many lay aside praying for the Dead. I can say no more, then that I wish they were better instructed. But he is afraid that if the Day of Judgment come sooner, fewer will be saved, though our Saviour was of the contrary mind, and tells us that if the time were not shortened, non fieret salva omnis caro. God was forced once to drown the World and shorten men's lives, because all flesh had corrupted their ways; to wit, by the great adhesion to corporal objects thorough the long enjoying of them. Once again will he be forced to destroy the World by fire for the like malice of men. In the mean while he is forced to contract the length of it, that more may be saved, and the number of the Elect come up in a shorter

ter time. I cannot omit his pleasant consideration, that some will have a horreur to pray for the Day of Judgment, because then the bodies of the wicked shall go to Hell. O pious meditation ! to have a horreur that that should be done which Christ shall command with his own mouth ; and themselves, if they will be partakers with Christ, must have a share in ! O pitiful hearts ! that will not pray for the glorifying of their own bodies, for fear that thereby others bodies may be cast into torments ! Yes, but there is another secret, which is, that peradventure their own body may be one. I perceive he makes them as prudent as the *Spanish* Souldier, who lying on his Death-bed, is reported, when he had occasion to speak of the Devil, still to term him *Senor Diabla*, and being evil used if he fell into his hands ; as he had experience that it hapned to Souldiers to fall into their Enemies power by the chance of War.

Numb. 22. He comes to the third Principle, of how the Fire of Conflagration works upon those in Purgatory, of which we have declared our Sentiment in the fifth Number, to which I must remit you, not knowing when I answered it, that it would be repeated here over again. Onely I must
note,

note; that he understood nothing at all of what I sayd, so that his Objections are against pure mistakes. Numb. 24. he repeats very stoutly that I deny any pains to be due after the remission of the sin, though it be most manifestly against my Writings and Doctrine, in all places where I have occasion to speak of it in my *Sacred Institutions*, in my *Book of Purgatory*, and *Reason and Religion*, &c. He is so out of the way in the whole, that I cannot set him right; for he mistakes all, and makes no sense of my sayings of this point, and corrupts what he cites of other points. Therefore I must stick the remedy of desperate pills, to cut out all this disordered incursible, until he having read what I have written upon his fifth Number, become capable of speaking and hearing sense in this matter.

~~And although I have already justly said that it is no part of the Church, but only a popular error which I forsake, yet will I not insist upon that to make needful correction. But I must tell him he must not expect to see clear demonstration. For that belongs to their metaphysical eyes, and not to them who learn only to babble of what they understand not. A Discourse drawn from the Principles of Philosophy~~

to his position (as he has done in his
 many sermons) of the truth of the

THIRD DIVISION.

Containing an Answer to his Eighteenth
 Chapter. *My Answer to his*
to the effect of his sermon, where I have occasion to speak
Believing in Europe's advantages to Her
Atticks. The Arguments in the Middle
State from Scripture maintain'd to be of
solid and true Adversary's misinterpretations
shown weak and inconsistent. Some other
things said to which I have answered here
 O thorough many Brambles we are
 come to his eighteenth Chapter. In
 the Preface of which he gives me two warn-
 ings. The first, that in reason he should re-
 spect some clear demonstration and justify the ab-
 bandoning the known persuasion of the Church.
 And although I have already justify'd that it
 is no persuasion of the Church, but onely a
 popular Error which I forsake; yet will I
 not insist upon that, not to make needless re-
 petitions. But I must tell him he must not
 expect to see clear demonstration. For that
 belongs to them that have scientificall eyes,
 and not to them who learn onely to bable of
 what they understand not. A Demonstration
 must begin from the first Principles of Philo-
 sophy,

sophy, and drive them on to his Conclusion, not take up his opinions upon Reasons, that fall into his mouth out of the Ayre. What he takes out of Faith, he must not be onely able to say the words, or cite them out of some good Book, but he must be sure to understand them well, and see that his Explication contradicts neither Divinity, nor any other Science. And of these two courses, neither he nor his Masters (as far as I could see) were ever guilty. They take Texts, and urge the letter, without ever penetrating the sense, and foregoing all principles, they fly at every question with fantastick flashes, like Hawks at their prey where ever they spy it.

2. His second warning is, that my Arguments are the out-casts and *refuse of their Author's*. And I am far from denying it. For indiscreet people are as subject to reject the best as the worst, and if I be not mistaken in this Authors, they ordinarily chuse the worst Opinions for themselves: being men that in Sciences hunt after vanity, and the pleasing of the unlearned multitude, and so are fit to make a shew in discourse, until the weaker sort be beyond their speculation, but never understand things solidly, nor are able to give satisfaction to sober Wits, who

look into the depth of a difficulty. He concludes that we never take notice of the Answer so fully made to the Objections we take out of his Authors. I will not return this upon him, and ask him how many Answers he has read in *Religion and Reason*, and my other Writings, which he hath read, as appears by the impugning of the Doctrine, yet will not cite, that he may say he knew not of those Solutions which he impugns not. But I will only say, let this encounter betwixt him and me bear testimony how fully and solidly the Answers are made.

He begins his plea with telling his Reader that *I borrowed the first and chiefest Objection from that infamous Heretick Ochinus*. How does he know this? *Bellarmin* says *Ochinus* uses this Argument. What then? therefore I found it either in *Bellarmin*, or *Ochinus*. How proves he that? The Spirit with which he writes tells him so. And my Spirit tells me, that the Spirit which tells him so is the Spirit of Error and Calumny. For when I wrote my Book I had neither *Bellarmin* nor *Ochinus*. Nor did I ever study *Bellarmin* so much as to remember such particularities out of him. I am not ashamed if I had taken any thing out of *Bellarmin* to acknowledge it. For I acknowledge him to be

the best Dictionary of Controversies I have
 seen; but a man must beware how he trusts
 either his Arguments, or Solutions: Yet he
 is very good to suggest to a man occasions,
 and matter that may be well used. Neither
 should I be ashamed to use any Argument I
 had found in *Ochinus*, or any other Heretic,
 so the Argument be solid to my purpose.
 And it is the prognostick of cofenage in the
 carriage of the cause, to make such excepti-
 ons. An Argument is good and bad by it
 self, not by his Authour; and *Aristotle* used
 to find the middle truth, by comparing the
 falsities extremely opposit; and so, if by
 comparing *Ochinus*, and your Divine, should
 find the truth to ly in the middle, I should
 think my action deserve honour, and to be
 profitable to the Church. Let us then look
 into the Argument it self. *Ochinus* to prove
 there was no Purgatory, argu'd, if there be
 a Purgatory, then Souls are deliver'd be-
 fore the Day of Judgment by prayers, but
 that is false by the Text alleag'd, &c. Now
Bellarmin if he had been a solid answerer,
 would have deny'd his first proposition, and
 told him, whether prayers deliver'd them
 before, or not, yet Purgatory remain'd safe,
 and *Ochinus* choak'd that he could not have
 open'd his mouth, and this Answer I have

found printed at Rome against the Greek Hereticks.

4. This Error produced a greater, to wit, that their great *Belarmus* was forced to confess that the words of the Scripture as they ly, or in the plain sence, are false; and so he fairly betrays the Catholick position of Purgatory to set up his own fancy. For his solution says that these words, *If there were no Resurrection, signify If the soul were not immortal*; which be so different meanings, that by many Philosophers the one was confest, and the other deny'd: So that the two propositions are neither the same, nor such as that their connexion is plainly seen. Therefore to make this good he fains a third, either falsity, or at least not proved, nor very probable; which is, that the writer of the second book of *Macchabees*, wrote after *Jenathas* his time, when by reason of a firm peace, the Jews fell to dispute about their Law, and so into great divisions and sects. Whereas by probability this Book was written in *Judas* his time. For it makes no mention of his death, which it had been a fault to leave out if it had passed before the book was written: which if it be true, these words must not be spoken against any infection of *Sadducees*, but of Greeks who had long domineer'd

mineer'd over *Jury*, specially in *Ananias* his time.

5. His fourth Errour is, that he makes our Saviour also make a false Argument, and to conclude the Immortality of the soul in stead of the Resurrection, and to make this consequence; *Abraham*, and *Isaac*, and *Jacob's* souls are alive, therefore *Abraham*, and *Isaac*, and *Jacob's* bodies shall rise again. The which would have silent'd the Sadduces, but rather have made them condemn our Saviour. For they better understood Resurrection, then the being of an abstracted spirit; which we see amongst even our Moderns, many profess not to understand; and many of those who profess to understand it, by their gross explications shew they do not penetrate it. But you may ask, what then is the force of our Saviours Argument? I answer, that we have it from our Saviour himself, who told his Apostles that *Lazarus* was asleep, not dead, and the like he spake of the Prince of the Synagogues daughter; and the phrase amongst Christians is used of all the Faithfull, and so we sing, *Requiescat in pace, venite adoremus*, and St. Paul expresses it in the words, *then* (says he) *those who have fallen asleep in Christ, are perished*. When then our Saviour says *God is not God*

of the dead, this word *dead* must be taken for *perished*, according to what St. Paul comforteth the Christians, and tells them they must not be sorrowful at their friends deaths as Gentils were, and giveth the reason *quod speramus in Christo*: that is, who expect no Resurrection, but think their dead for ever *perished*, and not to be as it were in a *sleep* untill the last Trumpet awakes them. There is yet a deeper Mytery in our Saviours words, which neither pleased *Belarmin* nor his admirer: to wit, that because all things are present to God in eternity, therefore no future thing is absent to God, so that *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob* did live to God, and so to God were really *living*.

6. He presses also that St. Paul urgeth the like Argument, saying, that if there be no Resurrection, *let us eat and drink, for we shall dye*. But this Argument sheweth plainly that his former solution was naught. For St. Paul speaks not to Sadducees, but rather to Pharisees, to whom he longeth the custom of often Baptisms, which he there urges: therefore it depends not on the connexion of the Immortality of the soul and Resurrection, but rather it supposes the Immortality of the soul to be a thing not known to the vulgar. For according

according to that saying of his, *Scriptura legimus non per se*, he apply'd his Doctrin to his Auditory. To the multitude he preached what they were capable of, that is, he propos'd the Good proper to the whole man, and as it were an excellency and height of these goods whereof they had experience, reserving the declaration of goods purely spiritual to the special audience of the more understanding part. Wherefore all his publick preaching being of the rewards as he received in the Resurrection, he maketh this Argument, if there be no Resurrection we are the most miserable of men, for in this world we enjoy no pleasure, and in the next we have no reward. So you see this solid resolution of *Bellarmin* to be compounded of pure mistakes and improbabilities. And yet, if his worship had been so curious, he might have found it confuted in the third account of the Book whence he took the objection made, though *Bellarmin* is not by name cited, nor every petty confirmation imagined, the which I should have done if I had taken it out of *Bellarmin*. *1. 10. 110. 37.* He yet presses That those who were seduced by the Gowls would not esteem of the Authority of *Judas Maccabaeus*, in which he shows either little experience or much cunning.

ning. For, as an Ordinary Protestant, such as depend from the Authority of their Preacher, if he see it prov'd that all Antiquity is against what his Preacher teaches, is presently struck with a horror, and begins to waver, because it is natural, to men to love and adhere to their Ancestours so those who were wavering amongst the Jews upon the persuasions of the Gentils, when they saw the publick profession of their Country in the fact of *Judas Maccabees*, would be much sollicit'd to forgo the apparent reasons of the Gentiles, and prefer their Countries belief before them. Either therefore your Diviner did not understand this, or else under the colour of some oblique Persons he would cunningly make his Reader believe that no body would take good by this example of *Judas Maccabees*. quæst. xiv. c. 11. 129

His opposition to my second Text is already answer'd, for St. Paul did not speak to the *Sadducees* but to such as received the custom of Baptisms or praying for the dead, and his Argument is as strong, as that when we, out of praying for the dead, prove a Purgatory and remission of sins in the next world, so does St. Paul prove the Resurrection. Whence it is manifest that he taught the Christians to pray for that good to the dead

dead which they were to receive at the Resurrection, and by consequence, that all the good the dead can receive before that day is already received before they are pray'd for.

9. The third Text he dissembles to understand and for that reason with his Paraphrase corrupts the Text: The Text it self says that his spirit or soul may be saved in the day of our Lord. He paraphrases *Saved* to signify to appear with great honour and glory. But every one who understands the word, knows it signifies to be freed from some danger or harm: and all Catholics, by admitting a particular judgment know all danger is past, therefore the meaning must be that in that day he shall be freed from punishment and misery. At length he turns off this Text with a jeer, telling us St. Paul was not so uncharitable as to wish no good to Onesiphorus before the day of Judgment. As if it were not charity mistaken to wish him what St. Paul knew was not to be had St. Paul therefore in this expression wisheth Onesiphorus all good that could happen to him which as yet he possessed not, and so shews there was no good to be expected for the dead, but either what they have before prayers, or else are to receive on the day of Judgment.

10. In his eighth Number he goes over the Text anew, and says, or rather grants, that indeed it is the common phrase of Christians to speak so, but that as it cannot be inferred thence that the wicked go not to Hell before that day, no more can it be inferred that the just commonly receive not their reward before that day. But the difference of the two cases is very manifest. For the damning of the wicked is not proposed to us as a thing to be desired and effected by our prayers, and therefore concerns not us when it is done. But the Reward of our Benefactors is proposed to be gained by our prayers, and therefore we ought to know what to pray for; and he concludes that Universally the phrase, which is the witness of our thoughts and of what we are taught, runs so as to wish good *in the day of Judgment*. The consequence therefore is most incontestable, and in a manner belonging to Tradition, that all our prayer for the dead must be that they may receive their reward *at the day of Judgment*. For although Tradition doth not expressly teach the Negative, yet because it Universally teaches the positive to pray for good *at the last day*, it follows clearly that the position putting another time is added to Tradition, and being in a

mat-

matter that depends of Revelation, and therefore cannot be known but by Tradition, it appears not only false & Novelty, but also ungrounded, and not to be followed. I must here note how your Divine wife heretofore asked for but one *Author* who should say that the acceleration of the day of judgment was that which we were to pray for, can heretell you that *such speeches are in most common use*, and that *the usual phrase* *was of this day* that, *as the manner of speech is so usual in Scripture, it is no wonder that the Fathers and our Liturgies do sometimes make use of it*: Where you shall see a gradation made, that in Scripture it is the usual phrase, but the Fathers and Liturgies do sometimes make use of it. As if the Fathers did not usually speak as the Scriptures, nor the Liturgies were made by the Fathers, and at least follow their customs, though every man of judgment cannot chuse but see the use of Fathers and Liturgies must of necessity be the same with the Scriptures whence they are taken, which were it confessed, as it is evident, what Testimony could I desire on his hands greater then this?

N. 7. he impugneth the Text taken from the tenth to the Hebrews, where the Apostle threatneth a Purgation of fire to them

them who sin after Baptism, which *Belet* is forced to gloss against the Text, to avoid *Wormes* his Error. For whereas the Text speaks of a fire that should feed upon those who were not quite contrary to God, which words cannot be understood of any fire but *Purgatory fire*, he very freely withour any ground of the Text, and onely because otherwise it will not stand with his opinion, takes no notice of the properties which particularise this fire, and by his own Authority puts in *Hell fire*, and a distinction of the effects of these two fires, to which sense a Cable is not strong enough to draw the words.

11. In his ninth and tenth Paragraphs, he impugns the Texts taken out of St. *Matthew* and St. *Luke*, concerning *Agreeing with our Adversary in the way*, that is, in our life time, that we may not be delivered to the eternal Judge: And he thinks we urge this Text for not reflecting upon the particular Judgment at the hour of death, and I cannot well deny it. For I do not remember that in any place of Scripture Christ is called Judge in regard of the next World, but either at his Resurrection, or at the last day. And besides what passeth at mans death, make to be very improperly called *Judgment*, and

and, if it were a true *Judgment*, this Formality of your *Adversaries* delivering you over to the Judge, I do not know that any one attributes to particular *Judgments*; which circumstances, though they were pressed where he found the Argument, he totally neglected and presses for himself those words of being sent to a Prison, there to remain until he pay the last farthing. This sayth he, is most naturally spoken of the day of Judgment, after which there remains no prison but eternal. And his discourses were good, if this delivery of our Saviour were not Allegorical; that is, a human expression of things above human reach; and therefore not to be expected to be verily & entirely to the material word: which taken away, it signifies no more then at the day of Judgment the sinners shall be punished without remission. But to think there shall be other Prison then the mans own *guilt*, or other torments then his own knowledge and *conscience*, is to be proved not supposed. And why this must require length of time more then what precedes the sentence, and of the which the sentence is the approbation as of all the rest that shall be executed all that day, I expect some better declaration before I frame a new Judgment properly so call'd, without any ground

ground in Scripture or Antiquity.

13. In his eleventh Number he treats the famous place taken out of the third Chapter of the *1st* to the *Corinthians*; but so as if he say'd not to give the sense of it, but only to waive the force from his opinion, no matter how much against the words themselves. For it being agreed between parties that the Apostle speaks of *the day of Judgment*, and of *material fire*; yet he hath three solutions. First that it is meant of no material fire, but of the fire of the *divine Judgment*. But this is to prevaricate against themselves, who agree there is a true *material fire* at that day, which is the faith of all Christians; and the Apostles words are plain, that that great day *shall be revealed in fire*. Now so far being the common Faith of Christians, it is against all sense to say this is not the fire which shall try the works of all men. For the Apostle gives for proof or ground why all men's works shall be try'd by fire, *because* (sayth he) *that day shall be revealed in fire*. What a strange perversion then of the Text is it to make the Apostle make this Argument. The day of Judgment shall be revealed in material and elemental fire therefore the works of men shall be try'd by Gods judgment or spiritual distinctness; and yet this is the sense

sense given to the Apostles words by this
 Interpretation. His second Interpretation
 is, that the meaning is, the sinners shall be
 saved as it were by fire, but fire precedent
 to the fire of Judgment, and this explication
 is more against the Text then the other. For
 the ground which the Apostle takes, that the
 day of Judgment shall be revealed in fire, can
 be no more brought for the cause why the
 sinners works shall be try'd by a precedent
 fire, then why they shall be try'd by Gods
 judgment. And besides, the Apostle so ex-
 pressly says that every ones work shall be try'd
 by the fire in that day, or, of that day, that no-
 thing can be spoken more plainly against
 the Text, then to say it is meant of another
 fire which went before. Likewise that speech
 that whose work abides the fire he shall be
 rewarded, but if any mans burn, he shall
 suffer detriment, is plainly spoken of the fire
 of that day, so that such an interpretation
 is a plain corruption. And so less can be said
 of his third explication, that the meaning is,
 that the fire shall manifest that is, shew what
 was done before, but not do any thing. For
 those words *If any mans work burns, he shall*
suffer detriment, cannot be understood of
 what was passed before the day of Judgment,
 but of what is done in that day. And there-

fore the *working* he speaks of must necessarily be the *working* of the fire upon the sinners works: so that it is evident he and his *Bellarmin* do not explicate, but corrupt the Text against the plain words of the Apostle.

14. The ninth Text concerning the *Remission of sin in the next world*, is brought to shew, that some sin remains truly in Purgatory to be purged, and that if onely pains are put in Purgatory, it is no Purgatory. This consequence we handled before, when he pressed we put no Purgatory because there was nothing purged untill the day of Judgment, Ch. 17. N. 4. Where I shewed how he himself acknowledges that there must be something that hath the nature of a *Blessing*, that purgation be necessary. His first objection is that *Calvin* uses this Argument. I answer it was the fault of them who explicated Purgatory as *Bellarmin* and he does, to give such an advantage to Hereticks by evil explicating our Faith, that their Argument though otherwise weak against Faith, yet are demonstrative against it in their Explications. His second solution is to fall into that condemned Heresie, that *after the souls are perfectly purged, yet they remain in Purgatory*. For he will needs put a *most intense* act of charity and contrition, for the first act of

of the soul separated; which expels the guilt of
venial sin; and by consequence, the souls
 after they be purged, remain so be torment-
 ed. Besides, he doth not reflect that if this
 act can deserve the Remission of the *sin*, it
 can also the Remission of all pain, which God
 assigns to perfect Contrition. His third
 solution is, that by the name of *sin* is to be
 understood *liability to punishment*: Which
 is very true if it be taken proportionally as
 it ought, for there can be neither *sin* without
 pain due to it, nor owing of pain but by *sin*.
 But the mystery is, that he will not understand
 this, though a man should beat it into him
 with a pestil; but will, if you say the *sin* is
 not wholly remitted as long as pains are
 due for it, cite you I know not how many
 Texts of Councils against you, and yet now
 he can cite out of St. Thomas, that the Re-
 mission of the pain belongs to the entire Remis-
 sion of the *sin*, and promises he will shew it to
 be the sence of the Fathers; which I shall
 be thankfull to him for, because it is a most
 plain truth. But yet I cannot allow his con-
 sequence, that when our Saviour says that
*a Sin shall not be forgiven either in this World
 or in the next*, it must in this World signify
 guilt, and in the other onely pain. For our
 Saviour does not use to make his words

travailing so wide, as within three words, and continuing the same proposition to make a double sense of the same word. He concludes that *Hisberto his Adversaries have brought no Demonstration*. Which whether it be true or no, let wiser men then judge: I can only say, that he hath solved no one Authority with any colourable answer, but either by falling into Errours, or abusing the words of Scripture by Paraphrases or inconsequent explications, which are easily made appear to any one who attentively reads my Replies.

FOURTH

FOURTH DIVISION.

Containing an Answer to his nineteenth Chapter.

The Testimonies from Fathers and Antiquary brought for the Author's Doctrine, in his Book of the Middle State, maintained to be assertive of it; and the Adversary's Interpretations shown to be most weak and fenceless distortions of their words and meanings.

HE begins his nineteenth Chapter with the Comparison of the multitude of Fathers he hath brought to the paucity of mine. To which I have nothing to say, for a comparison ought not to be made before both parts are seen, and he will have the Reader judge before he hath made any discussion of mind. Let the Reader therefore remember what is passed concerning his Fathers, which he professeth to have cited plentifully, to wit, one class of them who speak of our Saviours Resurrection in which we are more forward than he, that all souls were then delivered; Another class of such

Testimonies as are confessedly Erroneous and Heretical. The rest of Fathers speaking in common what we both agree in, unless St. *Julian* of whom I cannot pronounce, having not seen the Books: Lastly, certain stories which some Fathers mention, your great Divine making no difference betwixt the flaring of Divinity, and telling of news, but paralleling what a Father says he heard, to what the Church receives from Jesus Christ and his Apostles. Is not this think you a goodly score to vaunt so much of? He adds, *For the last thousand years, not so much as a whisper of any one Father.* In what age then lived *Alacinnus*, St. *Anselm*, and St. *Thomas*, who are cited for holding the Fire of Judgment to be the fire of Purgatory, and were in a manner the beginners of the Schoolmen?

2. In his second Number he comes to the objections. Before I begin them, I must give you a short note of the state of the question. You are therefore to take notice of two famous propositions in Antiquity, which modern use has much relinquished. The one is, that in the primitive Church the day of Judgment was hotly proposed to Christians, as in which both rewards and punishments were to be expected; Whereas now a days

Devotion and Reason

182

all the preaching almost tends to the present going to Heaven or to Hell. And this is so plain that he himself renders causes why it was so: The second Doctrine was, that because some souls needed purging, and this was apprehended to depend of Judgment, also the day in which the rewards or punishments were given, was deputed for the purging of the souls which needed purgation. This purging was by the Saints generally taken to be done by fire, & therefore of the last conflagration, and other purging we hear not of, until private Revelations took Authority to build Divinity, new Principles, since which time almost all the Devotion in the Latin Church runs after the delivery of souls from present pains of fire, which the Greek Church professed in the Council of *Florence* not to have heard of. But as in the former proposition, the difference betwixt Antiquity, and the present use maketh not either reprehensible, so in this later question there is no formal opposition, but the Essence Purgatory is conserved in both, so wit, that some souls are in torment until they be delivered: But Antiquity makes no mention of any delivery, but at the day of Judgment. Our later Revelations make irregular deliveries upon divers occasions.

Now what I aim at in the citation of Fathers, is to shew that the Testimonies brought out of them for purging of souls, all, or generally speak of the day of Judgment: so that as to the Fathers the question is all one, if whether there be a Purgatory, and whether the souls be released at the day of Judgment: and all the Authorities which prove Purgatory fire, be such as to prove that fire to be at the day of Judgment. Whence it follows, that who will put a Remission before, must look for Fathers who say that directly, and not rely upon the common speeches. Farther, the question is of that nature that it depends from solid Revelation out of Scripture or Tradition, and no less Authority is able to make it a Scholasticall Doctrin. It is likewise to be noted, that because the cry of Antiquity is for the day of Judgment, it signifies not that some few shall suffer that fire, but that all, good and bad, better and worse, every one shall from that fire reap their deserts, the good rewarded, the bad damned, the middle sort purged. This solution therefore that some few shall be purged by that fire, is excluded by the Universality, which because it includes all others, good and bad, must include likewise the purgable part.

3. His first Reply is against my citing Saint Basil, and Saint Hieron, to explicate the *Parabol* of fire to be the fire of Judgment. He answers *Bellarmin* cites these Fathers for the fire of Purgatory. Wherein I note two weaknesses; the one, that he takes *Bellarmin* to be some Oracle, not so he contradicted; for otherwise he should have been bound to shew that *Bellarmin* had done it *solidly*, and not onely that he had *said* it. But the more concerning weakness is, that he understands not the question. For I also cite this Text for the *fire of Purgatory*; seeing that I say the fire of Judgment is the onely purging fire. We are like to have good solutions from this man who marks not what the question is. Such a one is that which he cites of Venerable Bede, who, as far as can be seen in the words, says, some men explicate Purgatory fire of the tribulations of this life, whereof St. Augustin is one. *mod. in lib 309.* In his third Number he plays to the like trick. For whereas we cite three Places, not the Scripture, he answers what St. Hieron says is the meaning of that place of Scripture, which is nothing to our question, but what the cited Fathers say, whom he turns over with his old song, that some shall be purged by that fire, without giving any *ground* binds

ground out of the Fathers words for it. *St. Austin* Testimonies he here omits, peradventure he will remember them afterward. He goes on to *St. Denys*, whom I cite, to shew that all the good to be expected for the dead, was to be expected at the day of Judgment, because the prayers for the dead tend to that effect. This he cavils at, as if I made the consequence that therefore happiness might not be hoped for before, whereas I onely say that our intentions are directed to that day as is before explicated.

5. I cited farther *Origen*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Hilary*, *Laetantius*, *St. Hieron*, and *Rupert*, all most manifestly declaring the trying and purging of the last fire. But he hath a salve for all sores, to wit, *Bellarmin* says, that by the name of fire is understood Gods eternal Judgment. I wonder a man of his worth can be so silly, as to think *Bellarmin's* words without alleadging other proof, must pass for a demonstration. The man is one who hath taken much pain, and laboured for the Church of God, and it grieves me to be forced to diminish any way his credit, but this impertinent manner of proceeding obliges me to remember, what *Bellarmin* of his own order said of him, to wit, that *Scapler*'s solutions were better than his. And for the present, his solution is particularly absurd.

absurd out of this head, that seeing both these truths are acknowledged, that there is at the Judgment-day real fire, and *distress* Judgment; the one naturally signify'd by the word *fire*, the other improperly; where there is no occasion to understand the word improperly, it is doubly absurd to take it for both because it violenteth the nature of the word, and brings a calumny against the reality of *real fire* in Judgment, and because it makes the speeches of Saints improper without any ground or necessity. He cites St. Gregory Nyssen again, but because it is certain his works, particularly that which he insists upon, are corrupted by the *Origenists*, whose Error that was, which this good Divine offereth us for water of life, as is here before declared, I need not trouble my self about him. He takes notice of a place of *Origen* cited by me, in which he says the pains of Hell may cleanse him whom the Apostolical Doctrine could not, and he says this is *Origen's* Error of purging men in Hell after Judgment, and I will not peremptorily deny it, since it is certain he held that Error which his followers have sprinkled in St. Gregory Nyssen's his work, but I may freely say that it is not known out of these words whether it be or no: For *Origen* held the fire which began

begin in Indignation, to become afterward the fire of Hell. So that the word *Gehenna*, or of Hell must not be explicated of Purgatory, but truly of Hell; but materially, as the fire which will be Hell fire.

6. He taketh another place of *Origen*. N. 6. where *Origen* says, that in the second Resurrection sinners are purged by burning, which he says is against us, because we say that smarting in fire is punishing, not purging, which I acknowledg to be very true. But *Origen* says, that the fire he speaks of purges sinners what ever be bad of *malice*, *Flay*, *Scabbs*, and this is plainly purging, and as plain, saying that the sinner brought this to the second Resurrection. After this he brings for himself *Origen's* known Error, that some are *purged*, others *burned* after the Resurrection, for that is known to be his meaning.

7. Number 7. He explicates those words of *Tertullian* *Munda quoque uelito mori resurrectionis expensum*. In English Every small fault paid for by the duty of Resurrection; That is (sayth he) in the interval between Death and Resurrection. But I would willingly know of him, by what Grammar an ablative case govern'd by *expensum* can signify the same, as if the Preposition *in* were added.

If it be governed by *expense*, *Mora* was that which was weighed against the sin. If it be not governed of *expense*, what is weighed against the sin? If it be lawful for him to make new *Latin* Rules and Phrases to make the Fathers speak for him, I do not wonder at his great bragging of his Fathers and Councils; For there is no more to be done, then to say, These words shall signify my opinion, as he hath often done already. Nor needs he to bring his Examples of *this year*. For the *fore* is in the *Latin* which wants an *in*, which he puts in the *English* example.

8. His abusing of Saint *Cyprian* is much worse, whose words he translates so. *It is one thing to stand* (before the Tribunal of Mercy) *for pardon*, and quite another thing to come presently to Glory. *It is one thing to be cast into Prison without going thence until the last farthing be paid*; and quite another thing to receive presently the reward of Faith and Vertue. *It is one thing, by a long grief of torments to be cleansed from their sins*, and to be purged for a long time by fire; and another thing by sufferance to have purged all their sin. *It is one thing to hang in suspense concerning the sentence of our Lord in the Day of (their) Judgment*, and another thing to be presently crowned

created by our Lord. In this Translation, He puts in two words, the first before the Tribunal of Mercy; the other *Their* which breaks the sense of St. Cyprian, for other faults I mark not. We must first note that all this is spoken of the next World, as the *Antithesis* proves. For, to come presently to Glory is in the next World, so then must also be the waiting for Pardon, which he explicates to stand before the Tribunal of Grace for Pardon, whereas it signifies no more then *as yet not to be pardoned*. Again, what the Saint calls to *pendere in die Iudicii ad sententiam Domini*, which signifies plainly to depend of the sentence our Lord shall give in the Day of Judgment, he translates to hang in suspense concerning the Sentence of our Lord in the Day of [their] Judgment. So that by false translating and adding, he changes the whole mind of St. Cyprian, because it will not fail with his opinion; And against all sense, puts one part of the *Antithesis* in this world, and the other in the next. What Saint Cyprian speaks plainly of the Day of Judgment, by adding *their* he makes it to be spoken of the Day of Death. For it is plain the Day of Judgment taken without determination, signifies the last Day, the private Judgment being called so

so, neither properly nor at all, without one
 explicate himself to signify so much. He ob-
 jects, to excuse his violence by necessity, that
 the Souls of Purgatory are not in suspense of
 their Sentence. It is answer'd, not S. Cyprian, but
 he only uses that expression; And that there
 is no doubt but that the Souls in Purgatory
 depend for their delivery from the Sentence
 of that Day, which is the natural sense of the
 place. He would fain persuade his Auditory,
 that this place is against us, because there is
 an expression of *length of time*, as if I held that
 time stood still betwixt the death of a sinner,
 and the Day of Judgment.

9. In the next testimony cited out of Saint
 Chrysostom, telling us that *Onesiphorus* should
 have his reward in that dreadful day when he
 shall stand in need of much mercy, his Solution
 does so waver, that 'tis hard to find where it
 lyes. As to that part that *Onesiphorus* shall
 then receive his reward, he seems to say no-
 thing, but rather to deny that *most faithful*
men shall need mercy at that day; whereas, it
 is not onely St. Chrysostom's, nor onely Saint
 Hieron's, or Saint Hillary's, whom he cited
 when he would persuade us that we should
 not pray for the acceleration of that day,
 chap. 17 No: 21. but the apprehension of all
 the Christian World; and for this reason,
 because

because we must then render an account of all our actions, Saint *Hilary* specifies of every idle word: And here denying their standing in need of mercy, he infers, that *then* they must be in a *safe condition* until then. How will he excuse this from being a contradicting the general apprehension of the Church? But the good man seems to be afraid, that if we pray for mercy at that day, we should pray to have *now before* a very superficial and weak consequence; seeing the means to have mercy then is to have mercy in other things *before-hand*, and that the mercy there will not hinder the fore-going mercies, but rather compleat and increase them.

10. Lastly he comes to St. *Augustin*, and first to a place in which St. *Augustin* says that at the Day of Judgment, those who have not Christ as a Foundation are condemned; those who build upon that Foundation Wood, Hay, and Stubble, are punished (for that is the force of the *Latine emendatur*) that is, purged. His answer is, that they are sayd to be purged by that fire, because that last fire by not touching them, shows them to be formerly sufficiently purify'd. Is not this a very curious explication; they are punished, id est, not sancted; they are purged, id est, not purify'd. If these be good explications, let that pass for good also, that

a Doct making an Argument to the fifth Chapter of *Deus ad aduersum*. *Utrum Principium vite Christi habet ab initio*, and set in the margin *Ab initio i.e. creatura*.

¶ 11. The next Text of St. *Augustine* tells us, that the first of Judgment divides between the carnal People who are to be damned, and the carnal who are to be saved. Yes, says your answerer, by not touching them, or, if it doth touch some, gently dispatching. But this fine Solution is against the word *Carnal*, which signifies that there is in them purifying matter, which is not in spiritual ones. His second Solution, by not refusing the universality of the word *carnaliter*, admits that this fire belongs to all *carnales saluandos*, as well as to all *carnales damnandos*. in *dr aduersum*.

¶ 12. There follow two places out of St. *Augustine*, in which St. *Augustine* sayth that in the Day of Judgment the sins of some are to be remitted, which he easily puts off by saying those some are such as dy *se late*, that they have not been purged. But the evil luck is, that St. *Augustine* makes this Argument in the later place, that *unless this were so, there would be no remission of sins in the next world*. Which is to say, that all that are remitted in the next world, are remitted in the Day of Judgment, which is inuincibly to say there

It is ridiculous of him before that day to be so sure of it. And this same Argument is repeated in the next Edition, to which he answers he verily thinks that it is spoken not of *remission*, but of *remission*. How rationally he thinks so, you may judge out of Christ's words, *whithersoever ye shall say on earth, it shall be remitted in this world, or in the next*. Did any man ever hear such a boding construction, as to make the same word *remission*, not at much as repeated, *joy'd to in this world* to signify true remission, and *joy'd to in the next world* to signify *remission*? Have we not need to study Grammar again, to understand so obscure speeches? As for Pope Gregory, I cannot remember his very words, yet as far as I do remember them, they reason only to prove that there is a remission in the next world, but not that it is made at the Day of Judgment.

14. The last Text of St. *Anselm* is, that *in what state a man dies, in that he will be found the last Day*. This he says we esteem much, and I think with good reason, for the words are plain. His Solution is, that after this life there is no more merit, nor demerit, which he proves to be St. *Anselm's* opinion; but needed not, for we not only agree, but hold it more rigorously than he and his *Dis-*

Larmin

himself whom he cites. But we question what has that passion to do with these words, *In what condition every man last day finds him, in the same shall the worlds last day catch him.* For these words signify a kind of change to be made in him, and not onely concerning merit and demerit. Likewise the following words are, *For such as in that day he departs, such in the last day shall he be judged.* Which sentence plainly says, if he departs impure and deserving to be purged, the last day shall find him impure and deserving to be purged, what stories soever *Bellarmin* tells us of another thing.

14. There follows *Rossinus* his Testimony, which of it self might have been common to both opinions; if it had not clearly alluded to the words of *St. Paul*; which he and *Bellarmin* with him acknowledge to be spoken of the day of Judgement, and which by consequence draw the words of *Rossinus* to be meant of the same. To *Eucherius Lugdunensis* he answers, that he hath proved his words are against us; and there where he endeavoured to prove this, that is, Ch. 7. N. 8. I have answered his proof. Onely I must note that he cites the words for *St. Austin's*, whereas 't is clear they are not; nor that homily, of which the one half where these words are, is taken out of *Eucherius*; and therefore the

O 3

whole

whole Homily must be of an Authour later then St. *Eucherius*, whence his pressing of St. *Austin's* other places to confirm this, is nothing to the purpose.

15. He concludes his Chapter with saying, *there is no one Authority alleadged by which it is made clear that every one, though he dy'd never so long since, is to be detain'd in Purgatory untill the last day, though he had but one Venial sin to answer for.* In which words there are so many circumstances, that it were indeed very hard to find the proposition formally, and *interminis* in Scripture or Fathers. Therefore I deem it enough for me, if I find that the faithfull who dy in sin, without exception, must be purged by the fire of Judgment; if I find no mention of any ending of purging but by this fire; nay, if I find that there is no remission of sin in the next world, unless it be *at the day of Judgment*; and, finally, if I find the whole direction of Scripture and Fathers publickly to be to *that day*, without any mention of any change in the Interim. This I think enough for me, and plainly enough lay'd down, since your Divine hath not given a plausible solution to any one place of Scripture or Father alleadged. He confesses the *tryall by fire*, but puts it to be a *manifestation*, against the force of

of the words, without other reason then because it would be against his opinion: He confesses the Universal direction to be to the day of Judgment, He confesses there is no true Remission of sin in the next world, unless it be in the first instant, or be, as we say with the Fathers, in the day of Judgment. What can I ask more? unless it be, how the fire acts upon the good and bad. For he not putting it to have this force by preparing their Bodies to Resurrection, must of necessity make some fine procession of all who rise thorough this fire, and a great discretion in it to know which it must *touch*, and which *not*, and how much every one must suffer, and when it will be time to end the dance, and tumble with the wicked down to Hell, which will make a curious piece to contemplate; and so I must expect his farther leisure, and prepare my self to his next Chapter.

FIFTH DIVISION.

Containing an Answer to his twentieth Chapter.

Of Vindication Justice, and in what sense it is transferrible to God. His Ignorances and Mistakes of our Doctrin and Arguments. Why Fire cannot be an Instrument to torment Spirits. His raze Mystery of succeeding from Action by pure coaction, and of Obediential Power.

1. **T**Hough his twentieth Chapter bear in the front of its title, to answer the objection of Novelty, yet it discourses of other circumstances. As that Pope Gregory puts not any to go to Heaven, but onely to be delivered out of pains, and Venerable Bede the like; out of which we do not infer Novelty, but Error and want of Authority in the Revelations they bring. For *Alcimus* I do not remember I cited him for any such matter; but, for the opinion it self, to be for us. Nor do we make this consequence because *Abel* went not to Heaven, therefore others go not now; but onely by this example

ple relaine the Importunity he makes from the length of Time. He says no man can deny that St. *Aufim* and St. *Thomas*, held this delivery out of Purgatory, and brings for witness his first Number of the tenth Chapter, where there is nothing but two stories written in the two Saints lives, which to take for their Authorities is a great mistake. For the Authority of those stories belongs to the writers of the lives: who how prudent and exact they are, and by how many hands they received them, are guesser in the ayre. I was told within this week a story, how the Devil fetcht away a Minister at *Zurich*. It was read me out of a Letter of a man against whom I had no exceptions, but because it came thorough more hands, neither he to whom it was written, nor I could find faith enough to trust it.

2. As to his defence that their opinion is not new, I remit my self to his Answers in the places he cites: that is to my Answers of the fifth and sixth Number, Chap. 9. his N. 12. Ch. 7. N. 11. and 12. Ch. 5. N. 11. and 12. Ch. 14. And as to his solid Judgment that *these proofs are sufficient to make this opinion be defined for an Article of Faith*, it is not already, as of one side the Church expects no new Faith since the Apostles time.

so on the other side what he brings in his fifteenth Chapter is not able to make his opinion as much as probable. For the matter being a matter not knowable of his side but by *Revelation*, seeing it depends wholly upon Gods free counsel and will, beyond our reach otherwise then by *Revelation*, so it must needs follow that the Verdicts of all men who go not out of solid Revelations, are the Verdicts of blind men judging of colours.

3. In his second Number, he tells his Reader as concerning whether God sets *pains purely vindicative*, that we dress up old Arguments in new Clothes, the which I must needs confess to be a custom not onely laudable, but necessary. For, otherwise, no Argument that were old could be good, whereas experience teaches that oftentimes they are the best, and by the regular course of nature they must be so, for what is strongest endures the longest. But let us look into his process, he cites out of the Supplement two Arguments to prove there are no pains in Hell, and concludes, *Thus you see these Arguments do the Devil as good service in taking away Hell, as they do our Adversaries to take away our Purgatory.* So that your Gentleman, after he hath spent so large a book, to make people believe that the pains

of Purgatory are not so great as we make them, now will persuade the world we take away pain out of Purgatory. Who would have believed that towards the end of the book we should be put to lay open the question? I pray then take notice, that (as I have before also declared) we put the pains of Purgatory to be the *very same* that they do, *only longer*, and by *more constant* means, and of their natures *stronger* and more powerfully tormenting. The question betwixt us is only about the Instruments and manner of effecting these Torments. Wherefore if the Supplement giveth answers common to Hell and our Controversy, they are to be inspected not to be solid or rather, not well apply'd to our case.

4. To open therefore the particular case so it stands. Where men live under Government, by the course of Law certain actions or things are due from one Fellow-citizen to another, these are as well negative as positive, as it is equally due not to hurt my neighbour, as to pay him what I ow him. If I offend by not giving him his due, the Magistrate forces me to observe the equality, and keep Commutative justice as they call it, but, if I hurt my neighbour, then the Magistrate himself imposes a penalty upon me, either

either in purse or body, and this is said to be Distributive Justice, and particularly *the Justice*. Ask the reason of it, 'tis because I have offended the Magistrate. For if I had only offended my neighbour, *Revenge*, that is *anumere* *Passion* had satisfied him. In what then is the Magistrate offended? Why, the good of the Magistrate, as he is a Magistrate, is to have his Government not hinder'd, but easy to him. Now his Government becomes easy when every one does as he should do, and when they do otherwise, his Government becomes difficult, both because he is forced to put his own hand to hard work, and because the example, if the offender be not punished, makes others prompt to do the like. Here you see two reasons making *Prudence* Justice prudent and good, but both reasons concern the common Wealth. There is in private men a third occasion of *Revenge*, which is, that a harm done to a private man, makes him angry, that is grieved, and as it were sick for the time, and this he seeks to amend by *Revenge*. This is plainly the *Revenge* of fools, as proceeding out of passion, not of reason: but it is the most specious in human Conversation. By this a sensible man will easily understand, that if *Revenge* be to be attributed

to God, the translation is to be made from the first sort of *Revenge*, which becaus it is rational, may by reason be transferred to God who works, like the Authour of Reason, according to Reason; and not out of the second which grows out of passion, and is an affection of the Beast that is in man joyned to Reason. Notwithstanding this be so plain, nevertheless weak Divines make the Translation from the later, not distinguishing the one from the other, because of the common name, leaping from word to word, without considering the different signification. Taking therefore *Revenge* to be an act of Justice, and Justice to be a Vertue, they think the beastly act of *Revenge* to be a *virtuous action*, and attribute it to God.

5. Now to descend to the Answers of the Arguments out of the *Supplement*; it is plain that the Authour makes the pains of Hell not purely Vindicative, because he says they are ordered for the correction of those who are now in the Church. And when he says that the exercise of Divine Justice is grateful to God for its own sake, who can doubt but that he speaks of a rational exercise which is done for some end? Likewise that he sayeth that the punishment of sinners rejoyleth the Saints, it is plainly true, becaus
this

this makes the pains not to be purely *Vindictive*, and therefore are nothing to my Argument, which speaks onely of such kind of pains, for of others there is no question, and if there were any, it would press us more then them to answer them. But the question betwixt us and your Divine, is of the *quality* of the punishment, and the *manner* of executing them, and that special end to satisfy Gods Justice as they take it. For they explicate Gods Justice not as it regards the square and frame of the world, but abstractedly from circumstances, they think one act to be good, another to be bad of its own nature, and that God is bound to give a reward to good acts, and punishment to bad ones, purely out of a vertue whose nature it is so to do, which is called *Justice*. We on the contrary side put acts to be good or bad, in order first to the Doer, afterwards to Neighbours, in both to the End they were made for, and the Fabrick of Causes order'd to bring them to their Ends. This is the difference specially touching this point of *Vindictive Justice*, which they apply to the acts immediately, we proportion to the ends of Persons and the whole World. Conformable to this riseth another difference, that we put the punishments of the next world to spring connaturally

commaturally out of the behaviour of the Persons in this World, and so can give some account of their Quality. They put the punishments to be chosen by an arbitrary esteem of God Almighty, which is neither revealed, nor is there any ladder to climb so high as to have a sight of it: to help which defect they bring us Revelations, some of which may be proper, some allegorical, all imperfect, uncertain, and ungrounded, leaving nothing for the most part, - but the word of some one Person in a trance, or some other doubtful plight.

6. Hence you see that the Arguments of the Supplement are so far from being ours, that we stand more obliged to solve them than they, for they are against *torments* in General, and concern *Revenge* in the first signification, and our Arguments are against *Revenge* in the bestial meaning, and against this voluntary framing of torments; and therefore he is deceived, when in his third Number he says our two best proofs are solved: For they are not as much as touched. And to answer them he must not shew that pains *in common*, but *this quality* of pains, is profitabler then if they were natural, which he never goes about; and, for the other party, that it is rational to do them for pure *Revenge*,

Revenge, he sheweth plainly he understands not what what is objected, framing his answer in his fourth Number, about Revenge in common, and shewing out of that common place, that pure Revenge is rational; but that Revenge for a farther end is good. For all that is spoken of Revenge in common is unquestionably fulfilled in that branch; whereas pure Revenge is an irrational and unfitting action.

517. In his fifth Number he attempts to solve an objection which truly does irreconcilably confute that principle, *that to every good will is due a Reward, and to every ill one a Punishment*. The Argument is that the best deeds are in Heaven; the worst in Hell; neither rewarded. His answer is, that the time of merit and demerit is passed, which is true; but nothing to the purpose. For nevertheless it quellcth that Principle in common, *that to every ill a proportionable payment is due*. Therefore the ground of their Doctrine is false, and they must make pains due to sin for some farther end, that is, by rational Revenge; not for pure Revenge.

518. Number sixth; he creates an objection which he mistakes. For, because in explicating corporal torments, we sayd that by distraction they were alleviated or hinder'd; (as

It is written in the life of St. Thomas, that when his leg was to be scar'd, sitting himself to study hard, he felt not the burning, & he imagin'd the flames to be meant of abstracted spirits, and that they could not divert themselves; whereas before he acknowledges for my Doctrin, that acts are unchangeable in pure spirits; and out of this apprehension he teaches us, that some actions are voluntary, but not free, a Doctrin true, but not to the purpose. My Argument then is out of the Doctrin of St. Thomas, taken by most Divines for an Axiom, that *the will cannot be forced*. And the demonstration of it is plain and set down in St. Thomas; because force is against the inclination of the Person or nature forced; the Will is the inclination of the person said to be forced; therefore the act of the will is still according to the inclination, and by consequence never forced. This is so plain, that every common Divine knows it, and yet is mistaken by him that he distinguishes not between doing an outward action at which a spirit willfully grieves, and the making by force an Action of the will; and upon this score, sets in array a Squadron of places of Scripture to fight against a shadow.

9. Number seventh, he advances another question, to wit, why the omnipotent agent should not have power by himself, or rather his self, to make in the soul an afflictive Quality? I gave you three answers. One, for want of a subject, for in the *will* there can be nothing but *voluntary*, since *voluntary* signifies no more then the act of mans inclination. The second Answer is, because there are no such Entities as you call Species or qualities makeable, as every one who knows more then trivial Philosophy can tell you. And thirdly, because God is no hangman, but has all nature to serve him when he pleases, to punish a creature, and defiles not his own hands with such actions. He steps on to *fire*, and asks why that cannot torment a soul by some unknown way to us? I answer because it cannot *burn* us, for all that put *fire*, put *burning*; but, *burning*, seeing it is the dissolution of a thing that has parts, cannot by all the Invention he can give to God, be in a thing that has no parts; therefore *fire* cannot torment but Metaphorically. He says our Arguments have a thousand times been solved, but because he takes not the pains to repeat either the Arguments or Solutions, I also may pass them in silence. Mine be in the eleventh account of my book of the

Middle State of souls. He may assign the solutions where he pleases. Onely to his saying, They are solved, I must oppose my words, that they neither are, nor can be to sensible men, that have not speculated beyond all reason. He objects St. *Austin*. I answer St. *Austin* affirms nothing of this point, but onely presses an Argument of the Unity of the body and soul. I answer, Philosophers affirm that Union to be of *Actus* and *Potencia*, and that such an one cannot be betwixt a *Spirit* and *Fire*. The meaning of those words, and the reason why the same cannot be said of *fire*, here is no place to declare; It is enough they are Terms common in the School.

10. He proceeds to prove, that at least there is corporal fire in *Hell*, because our Saviour shall say to the damned, *Depart from me you accursed into eternal fire, prepared for the Devil; and his Angels*. Another man would have proved out of this place; that there was no corporeal fire in *Hell*. For what can be more incongruously taken, then to say, that one had prepared *corporeal* fire to punish *Spirits* withall? Wherefore this qualification of *prepared for the Devil* doth clearly manifest the fire to be *spiritual*. If one, who found his Garden dry'd with the hot Sun, should send to *London* to buy a Pen-

knife to water it withall, would not any man that heard it judge him to be mad? This sport he makes with God Almighty, telling us that when he would punish *pure Spirits*, he took *corporeal fire*, which is far less fit for such an effect, then a *Pen-knife* to water a *Garden*. And yet Christ expresses, that the fire, into which the damned were sent, was fit to punish *Angels*, that is, nothing less then *corporeal fire*. As for his Testimony from the Author of the Dialogues, I hope to have a time to answer it more largely then is here fitting.

He presses farther St *Julian's* words, that no wise man denies the souls of Reprobates to be detain'd in fire. But to have made an Argument, he should have added the word *corporeal*. For truly the Scripture so frequently using the word of *fire*, it is not for a good Christian to deny the word, which were to affront both the Scriptures, and all such as use, without examination, the same words: But yet 'tis the part of a Divine, to admit of the literal word, and understand the sense in, that it may stand with God's Wisdom. As for *Beckermin*, and *Maldonatus's* censures of temerity for resisting the consent of School-men, I have answered it fully in my *MUSCARIUM*, *Ventilationis doctrinae*,
ma,

to which I remit my Reader: For such questions, amongst ignorant people, are not to be much handled. He presses farther, how our explication of Torment is not convenient. As to that of loss of past pleasures, he says their state sets them above it. In the which he shews himself ignorant of the nature of material sin: for it doth subject the soul to things under its worth, and therefore is sin; and this subjection is far greater in Hell, then in this World. As to the delay of future glory, he says we forget ourselves to make that grieve the Souls, since it is but *one moment*, though it were of *Millions of Ages*. Nor can I deny, that I forget my self sometimes in speaking truths to them, who are not capable of them. Therefore I instruct him for the present, to put instead of *delay*, the *not having of glory*, and if he pleases he may add, *while so much time run*: for all this he knows to be my constant Doctrine, that the Soul knows and grieves for. And as for farther explication, he himself hath remitted us to his 22. Chapter. As for *disorderly affections remaining*, he says there are none, as he hath proved: but we reply'd, It was Heretic to put Purgatory without them. In his twelfth Number he seems something to stumble at his fire, because the

Gregorius explicate it a fire *not combustible*, and the good man does not perceive, that that signifies *no corporeal fire*. For, as if one should say a *knife*, but *not made to cut*, a *beetle*, but *not made to maul*, an *eye*, but *not made to see*, it were plain he must needs take away the essence of the thing signified by the word, and by consequence the property of the speech: so he that says a *fire*, but *not burning* etc, clearly speaks of no *material fire*. For *Fire* is as properly an instrument of *Burning*, as a *Beetle* of *knocking*, or a *Knife* of *cutting*.

13. In this thirteenth Number he pretends to reveal a *mystery* (as he calls it) of *surceasing from action by pure cessation*. An high mystery, that *surceasing is cessation*. Well; But let us seek to understand this mystery, if we can reach to it. *Painfully purging fire* (says your Divine) *being elevated as an instrument of God's revenging will*, to produce in such intensity that *afflictive spiritual quality*, with which the Soul is tortured, *atteth so long, and no longer*, then his Justice moves his Will to apply it: Then that *fire that acted only as obedientially elevated by his Will, can now act no farther*. Behold the mystery, &c. And I submit: for what is sayd passes all understanding. Philosophers, which use common sense

in

in their Philosophy, tell us, that a Knife of it self hath a fitness to cut; But when a Carver takes it to make a Statue, or other pretty Work, Art doth elevate the Knife to an higher work, then it hath by the proprieties of its Nature, which make it onely able and fit to cut. Likewise a Pipe, or Recorder, of its own qualities, is fit by the inspiration of air to make one sound, as we see in the drone of a Bag-pipe; but, when a Musician useth it, there comes from it a *song*, which the Art of the Musician makes dependently from the natural sound of the Pipe. This now understanding Philosophers call *elevating* the Knife, or Pipe, that is, to make the natural Action of the Pipe more perfect and excellent, then their proper qualities did dispose to. But in later ages, Mysterious Divinity by the assistance of canting Philosophy is soar'd beyond all wisdom, and tells you, That all Creatures have in them an *Obediential* power to do what God will have them. As for example, If God will have a Knife to create an Angel, the Knife will presently do it in vertue of its *Obediential* power. And if you say a Knife signifies an instrument, or power to cut, and look that it shall make an Angel by *cutting*, as it makes a Statue, they take you for a dull

fellow, and repeat to you that it doth not
 this by its nature, but by its *obediential* vir-
 tue. So that if you will look to the solemn
 Principle, that nothing doth but what it can
 do, and nothing can do but what is virtually
 in it, this Knife must be by *Obediential*
power, which nevertheless they say to be the
 very Entity of the Knife, the nature of all
 things, which it may be elevated to make, to
 wit, a Man, a Horse, an Eagle, an Angel, and all
 sorts of Angels. O height of Learning, is not
 this a pure MYSTERY? Truly it seems to
 me no less. But yet his Mystery is higher, for
 when the time comes that the punishment is
 enough, God, and Fire, and Soul remaining
 unchanged, the fire leaveth to work by a
 deep understanding of God's Judgment, and
 without changing becomes changed from
 an *action*, to a thing *not able to act*. Is not
 this pretty stuff to beat poor Pulpits withall?
 Are not the Schollers brought up in such
 Principles like to be great Lights of the
 Church? and their Masters worthily held
 for the *Masters of the world*? Who shall tell
 us, that every thing is all things, and the
 same thing without any change now able to
 work, now not? against common sense,
 and the first notions common to Mankind.

Is not this a pure MYSTERY? Truly it seems to me no less.

SIXTH DIVISION.

Containing an Answer to his twenty
first Chapter.

*Our Saviour's sufferings not forc'd. More mis-
takes of our Doctrin. The improprietie
of the paine he puts. Places from Scripture
answered. His success in impugning of our
Opinion, concerning the indivisible duration
of Souls. His Ignorance of the Ground of
Eternity.*

His 21st Chapter beginneth with this
Question, *whether the paine, his
Way puts, are to any purpose?* In which, it is
explicated already, how by the name of Paine
are understood the Instruments, which are
proper to his way: For as to the griefs, feel-
ing we both put the same, no question can be
between us. Now to shew any utility in
their proper explication, he never goes
about it, he penetrates the matter so little.
Nor is there any fruit imaginable to the
Souls there, to be reaped out of this, that the
paine come from an extrinsecal Agent, but

rather they are more profitable, if they come from an intrinsecal source. Nor to us can there come any profit, seeing they cannot be known but by Revelation, of which there is none; since it is constantly known, that the *Latin Church* consented to the *Greek Church*, to hold without opposition there was *no true fire*, besides, so the torments be the same, what matter is it how they are made? But he presses, that whether the Fire be corporal or no, concerns not the main question. The which, though it be true immediatly, because to be *corporeal fire* may stand without the ending of the torments before the Day of Judgment; yet peradventure the ending of Torments before the Day of Judgment is not necessary, yet rationally is joyn'd with the succession of the pains, and that with the corporeity of the causes.

2. My Objection went higher, and sayd, such kind of pains would prove no pains, but pleasures to the Souls of Purgatory; being they could not but be joyce at the means of gaining Beatitude, and even in this World great courage takes away the force of the torment, which they could not want. His Answer is, that our Saviour's courage was greater then any man's, and the good to be obtained

obtained by his Passion motive enough to rejoyce, yet hindered not either sorrow in his soule, or that his pains were unparallel'd. This Objection I answer'd already in *Religion and Reason*, pag. 114.6. wherefore I may be shorter here; onely admonishing him, that the divinity, which saves our Saviour had those griefs by force, and that his Soule was not able to have hindered them even by the natural perfection it had; is too low for a Champion of his Company. Let him look upon the Transfiguration, and there see what the power of Christ's Soule was over its Body: Let him look how he dy'd *ramplente*, which moved the Assistants to knock their breasts, and say, *Vere Filius Dei erat*. Which your Divine may do well also to do, for divulging this Doctrine so prejudicial to Christ's honour, as to put him to have been forced by natural causes to the sorrow, and pains, which he suffer'd. Out of which Doctrine depends a very ill consequence, that not onely Christ's fancy, but even his concupiscible part was subject to *variation*, and *passion*. Now if your Divine doth not hold this, why doth he apply it here, to shew that the constancy of the Soules in Purgatory cannot abate their sufferings from *external causes*, and turn them to pleasures?

Another

Another pitiful answer he adds, that the Torments of Purgatory do not cause the entrance to Heaven, but onely remove what hinders it. As if he, that *desires* Heaven, were not glad to have the hinderance taken away.

In his third Number he pretends to answer the disproportion between corporeal pains, and spiritual offences; but, by his great skill in missing of the question, his first Answer returns the question upon us, as if we held that *some are burned more grievously, on longer than others at the Day of Judgment*. This which is a pure mistake of our Doctrine, as I have often repeated. His second Objection is of the bodies of the blessed, and damned, the which he mistakes also, thinking those pains, and glories to be immediately proportioned to the Acts of Vertue, or Vice, which they are not. But the immediate proportions are of the Acts of the blessed, or damned souls in their lives, and in their ending states. Now as these Acts are stronger, so do they diffuse into their bodies different qualities, and hence it followeth that the bodies are proportionably rewarded, not that the good, or ill of the body hath any proportion to the merits, or demerits, but because the dispositions of the bodies follow

of the first acts, and dispositions of the
soul, which have proportion to the work of
the Spirit. He pictures Scripture: First out of the
Apocalypse, where there is no mention of
temporal and spiritual, but merely of *dominions*
and *punishments*. Secondly, from *Job* Chap.
3, declaring that his *offences* and *punishments*
should be weighed in a pair of Scales. What
shall I say? If your Divine were asked, whe-
ther the least venial sin be not worse than all
the Torments *Job* suffered, he would say
questionless, Yes. What then doth he mean
to make of this saying of *Job* 3. That *Job*
was a Fool to make such a proposition? Sa-
rely in his way no less can be understood.
But, that we may not onely confute simpli-
ty, but deliver true Doctrine, we must tell
him, that *Job* cast his eyes upon the Provi-
dence God useth over the good and bad in
this World, to shew to his unpiouful friends,
that those harms were not come upon him
for his excess of misbehaviour beyond o-
thers, but out of God's special pleasure. So
that this example is nothing at all to our
question, since it speaks nothing but of God's
eternal Providence in this World.

113. Like to this is his next out of *Leviticus*
where to several sins several offerings
were parallel'd, the which (it seems) he would
have

have to be understood, as if the gifts were the true worth of the offence: which I believe our Casuists, and Ghostly Fathers will not allow of. Another Objection is from the Proposition made by our Divines to the *Greeks*, and by them not admitted, which in great words he vents, saying, *All the Latine Church stands accused of folly*. Here the force of the Objection lyes in the word *folly*; a worthy Objection as the most of his are. For, no man doubts, but every speculative proposition, which is false, may be in rigour called *folly*; but civility gives this name onely to such falsities, as are avoided by the most of that Art, or Science, to which the discovery of such follies appertain. Now to make an Argument, this Proposition must be termed *folly*, though in the same breath he professes few do avoid it. He repeats divers other Authorities, which, as far as we get the books, we examin'd in the places in which they were first urged. He adds the practice of Indulgences. But every man knows they are proportioned to the Penitential Canons, not the Laws of Purgatory, when it is sayd, *so many days, or years pardon*, and for the *plenary delivery*, it hath been heretofore discussed. At last he comes to reason, and there he tells us, that God looks

not on the Physical Nature of the Acts, but upon the Moral; But what this *Moral* signifies he declares not. Now according to my skill, I must profess, that I take it to be a mere non-sensical expression, when it is apply'd to spiritual acts. For an act of the will is Morality it self, and how much it is *physically* harmful to the soul, so much is it *morally* naught; and how far *profitable*, so much is it *morally* good: so that to distinguish *moral* and *physical* in intrinsecal acts of the will, is but to give a bob instead of a bit, a name instead of a thing, a covered mess without any meat in it.

6. In his fourth Number your Divine (as it seems) feels himself in some *streights*, for he crys for *room*, and not without effect, for he hath found a matter of twenty Leaves to contain one discourse: yet I fear he has not made room in his brain for truth, which is so elevated, that a fancy stuff with corporeal imaginations, and the sounds of unexamind words, can afford it no place. Nevertheless I must try to break in, if not into his, yet into our common Auditors apprehension: *Si qua fata aspera rumpam.*

7. In his fourth and fifth Number he explicates my Arguments, for the most part truly, whether sufficiently, or no, our encounter

ter must declare. Number sixth he begins his battery with telling us, that he hath shew'd it to be contrary to the Doctrine both of the Church and of our own profession, Ch. 17. N. 2. and 13. Where our answer also is given as far as depends not from this place. The substance of it is, that a *present* relief of the dead by prayers, is neither the expectation of the Church, or understanding Persons of their own opinion: who all teach we must remit circumstances and substance also to Gods high Counsel, and will. And besides it is declared, how the unchangeableness of spirits hinders not, that the souls have relief in Purgatory, and that Relief at the very time of prayers is contrary to the very sense of their own Divines.

or 8. After this your Divine is equivocated something strangely, not distinguishing between the *duration* of a Spirit, and our *measuring* of their duration. For no man disputes this with him, whether we apprehend the duration of Angels, or Souls, as we do the durations of Bodies, and so say, that such a thing, or action, endured so many days, weeks, moneths, or years; But whether their proper duration be conformable to our apprehensions, or that our apprehensions be, as to the truth, a weak babling, is for

us, but far below the truth of the thing, and no more like it, then a Body is to a Spirit. So he need not trouble himself, whether our expressions be by true time, for they are by that same time, by which we measure our actions and all corporeal motions. Therefore all his examples are easily, I will not say answer'd, but assented to, as not speaking of the question, that is, what the duration is in itself, but of how it appears to us, or how we apprehend, and express it. But not to leave him thus in the dark, I will exemplify a little. When we apprehend God is, is Wise, is Just, is Good; *St. Thomas* as his School will tell you, that Being, Wisdom, Justice, Goodness, doth not signify the same that they do when they are spoken of *St. Peter*, or *St. Paul*: But that God is of a notion unknown to us, yet of such an one as we are sure in our low Language, and conformably to our incomparably undervaluing God apprehensions, is to be not so much explicated, as vestigated by the notions, which are signified by these words of *Being, Wisdom, Justice, Goodness, &c.* So likewise true it is, that Christ was three days in the heart of the Earth, but in such a manner, that wise men understand that these words have not an Univocal signification in the duration of his Soul,

Soul, and the duration of his Body: but in this, in a signification known to us: in that, in a signification so above our knowledge, that nevertheless we know it is to be so explicated or expressed to a human apprehension in the weakness of this life.

9. In his seventh Number, he attempts the explication of the necessity of existence of divers creatures, and tells us, that all that can be requir'd is most briefly and accurately expressed by *St. Thomas*, 1. P. Q^{ue}. 30. A. 5. Where another man would have told him, that every man doth not follow *St. Thomas* his explication; I onely enquire of him whence he hath certainty of this his saying, that *St. Thomas* hath in this place declared all that is necessary. For having treated it more largely in other places, it is to be suspected he thought somewhat necessary in other occasions, which had been superfluous to his Theme in the place cited. His ninth Number he begins with *Whence you see the Eternity of souls, &c.* Whence I see, he takes all, which he hath cited out of *St. Thomas*, for coyned money, so that I may conclude that the certainty of his Doctrin is no more then that it is *St. Thomas* his opinion: which is a poor payment for him, who seeks the contentment of his understanding. I reverence

St.

St. Thomas his Doctrin, because I find many and great truths in him, but to give him the privilege of Scripture, that things are so because he says it, that I am taught by himself not to do. And in our own present case I am forced to specify one particular; which is, that some things are removed from permanency in being, because their Essence neither consist in Mutability, nor is the subject of Transmutation, yet those things have Transmutation joyned unto them. This St. Thomas exemplifies in the Heavens: But later Phenomena's have shown that the Essence of the Heavens is subject to Transmutation; Wherefore that example fails him. The other example is of Angels, which truly St. Thomas says, but proves not here, so that until that be proved, we know no substance that is not the subject of Transmutation, and yet hath Transmutation joyn'd to it, and he who is acquainted with St. Thomas his Principles will expect that there can be no such; since St. Thomas teaches that Accidents have no existences of their own, and are but modifications of the Substances to which they belong; and consequently their existence must be of the same nature of which is the existence of the Substance, seeing it is the very same. He tells us also, that St. Thomas

saith

saith that Angelical intellections are measured *truly by time*, or as he says afterwards *by true time*. But I remember not that word *true* in him, nor do I think it stands with the exact Logick of that Prince of Divines. For *Time* signifying a common measure, how can there be true time where there is not a common measure? but every act must be its own measure, and one be longer, another shorter, without any common rule. Besides *St. Thomas* knew the motion of the Heavens had appropriated to it self the name of *Time* before any spiritual actions of Angels were talked of. Wherefore the name of *time* could not be attributed to Angels but in respect of the motion of the Heavens, because the duration of the acts measures the acts, as the duration of time measures our actions and corporeal motions, which is plainly to take time as applyed to Angels and their actions in an improper sence, and one derived from the former.

10. After this to the end of the Chapter, he doth nothing but lay forth his own conceits, without any likeness of Proof or Argument. In so much that all he saith for himself, is nothing but the acceptance of *St. Thomas* his words without any proof. Only I note that he lets us understand by the way, that he

he knows not what signifies the Necessity of Existence upon which is built the nature and notion of Eternity. To declare which, you are to look into the Metaphysical Principles of nature, as *Aristotle* does in his two first Books of *Physics*. There you shall find that a corporeal substance is divisible into two parts, the one which makes it be what it is, the other a pure possibility to be any of many; and how it is clear out of this, that the former part is it by which Existence is had; and which hath nothing betwixt it self and existence, and therefore is inseparably connected with existence. The later part because of its indifferency to divers forms, is separable from any particular existence, and so is cause of the corruptibility of the whole; the existence of the whole perishing in the separation of the Form from the Matter, in all things but in man. Hence it follows, that if such a thing as we call a *form* be capable of existence without the support of *matter* it can never perish, because it is of it self, and without mediation bound to existence. Therefore such a substance is called *Eternal*, and is so because it is such a *form*, and so annexed to *existence*. The cause then of *Eternity* is nothing changed, whether the *form* be to be reunited

ted or no to the matter; nor depends it of having no contrary, but the having of no contrary flows from this, for contraries are only found where there is a common subject; nor from I know not what obligation in God, which are the principles he seems to conceit to be the grounds of Eternity.

SEVENTH

SEVENTH DIVISION.

Containing an Answer to his two and twentieth Chapter.

How Angels understand, and why necessity shall be used. His Ignorance of what is meant by true Time, and mistake of St. Thomas. His skillfulness in applying allegorical places of Scripture (like the Ambrosian place) to Spirits literally. The fruit of his superabundant Demonstrations. His self-magnifications and ostentations, and how weakly he refutes a pretended Demonstration of an unknown Author. A notice of his and many others in his School.

WE are now come to the so often promised two and twentieth Chapter, and hope to have the happiness to see the Myſteries worthy of so great expectation, but they ly not in the first four Numbers, whereof the first contains no more then a weak explication of my Tenets, the which I will take notice of as occasion and his Errours themselves shall present. In the second Number your Divine wonders to see all School-men raxed of Ignorance: So should

I to see his wonderment, if I did not know the cause of it. For every School-man who thinks himself sure of his conclusion, cannot chuse but tax all that be against him of ignorance in that point. But those Divines who think nothing to be certain, or (which is all one) true (for what is not certain is not true to him to whom it is uncertain) have no reason to tax others of Ignorance, knowing themselves to be ignorant, & in verity thinking there is no Science, upon this Argument which to them seems evident; *We have as much knowledge as any body, but we have no Science; therefore no body has any.* The *Major* Pride and Vanity makes evident to them; The *minor* experience demonstrates to them and others: And the conclusion is not only the Condemnation of all School-men but of human Nature it self. But this must be born withall; because they say it, who call themselves; *All the world, the whole Church, &c.* though never so impudently. I that do nothing but what every good Divine doth, and is obliged to do, that is to say, who apprehend that all who hold noe that which I conceive to be true, are amiss in this point, am unsufferable, and to be condemned upon the score of many being against me. Again, your Divine wonders to see St. Thomas stand

stand accused to have mistaken somewhat that followed out of a former Verity acknowledged by him. And because it was apparent that this bore no blame, but is a thing necessarily befalling to any Divine who writes very much, and arises from the weakness of our nature, your Divine adds out of his own Treasure, that he is accused of *missing grossly*; the which all who know my respect to that great Doctour, know I would not say even if I thought it true. His third and fourth Numbers are but a repeating of the same Doctrin and Testimony of St. Thomas.

2. In his fifth Number he proposeth to shew that *Angels and Spirits have change of Intellections and Affections*. And first he tells us how Angels and Souls come to know, to wit, by Gods infusing of certain Entities called *Specieses*, of the which he bestows upon every one what is conformable to their natures, and this in his first Number he takes for my Doctrin. Which because it is not so, I am constrained to lay forth a short declaration of my Doctrin in this point: Which is, that in an Angel, out of the force of his creation, his Essence is actually in his intellectual Power, that is, is actually *understood*. Now to understand a thing connected

pected to his Essence the Essence it self is
 cause enough; as the hollow of a bowl
 seen, is sufficient to make us understand what
 globosity is necessary to the filling of that
 vacuity. So out of the Essence of an Angel
 is to be understood both the quality of the
 cause which is to make it, and the quality of
 such matters upon which the Angel can, or
 is made to act: that is, God above him, and
 Bodies below him, as far as they have con-
 nexion with him: And these two parts we
 think to be connected with all other Crea-
 tures whatsoever. Whence the extent of
 his knowledg we conceive to be all existent
 substances, and all their actions, which fol-
 low the substances. As for the manner of his
 knowledg, instead of syllogistical discourse,
 we conceive to be such an intuition as some-
 times we have after we have found a truth
 by discourse, and for the most part have in
 the assenting to those Verities which we call
per se nota. So that an Angel sees in his
 Essence that there is a God as clearly, as we
 see the verity of this truth, *that the whole is*
greater then its part. And in the same man-
 ner he sees in God, that God hath made the
 world, and so every other verity, as it hangs
 to these by a connexion, in vertue of which
 we might draw the same consequences, if we
 had

had Science be time, which he draws without time, by force of pure intuition, and intuitive strength. He cannot then know the farther conclusion, without knowing the nearer, nor any other, without knowing his Essence.

7. You will easily see by this, that an Angel cannot have the knowledge of a particular thing or accident, without having the actual knowledge of all the causes on which it doth depend; and therefore that his actual knowledge is extremely large. To which if we joyn, that whatsoever is foreknown, strengthneth and prepareth the understanding towards the succeeding knowledge, you will not fear the understandings being clogged with too many objects. And out of that you will see a necessity that the Angel must see all things at once, unless there be some that have no connexion with those which are linked to his Essence, and that such he can never see unless by some unnatural means. And so you have my thoughts of the manner and extent of Angelical knowledge. And the like apprehension I frame of separated Souls though there be some differences which concern not our present quarrel.

In his sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth Numbers, he pretends that this our Doctrine is against many verities which we know by

Faith:

Faith: Whether these, that *Angels know not* future things depending of hazard, or the present secrets of mens Hearts, or the number of elect or damned, be any of these which he thinks to be of Faith. I know not, but I well know, that I know no ground why they should by any understanding Divine be so accounted, and since there is nothing for them but some places of Scripture enlarged beyond the intencion of Scripture, and one prayer of the Church, and all these in common without any special mention of Angels attributed to God alone; in which kind of speeches God is commonly understood to include his Ministers, and to be contradistinguished onely against the knowledg of Men, without entring into the nature of Spirits unknown to us, and not concerning our government in way of Christian life to be curious of. The like is of the souls knowing what their posterity do in the Earth taken out of the 14. of *Job*. Which out of the Hebrew Text we understand to be that the dead man takes no notice of his posterity, *non advertit eis*, to wit, he meddles not with it or them, which is also a legitimate sence of the word *ignoravit*, when it is said *Esay 61. Abraham nescivit nos, & Israel ignoravit nos*. See *Muscarum Vntilatio* 7.

4. In his tenth Paragraph he cites out of St. *Thomas* that the *Angels* were not created in *Beatifical Vision*, and in the eleventh, that it is against *Scripture* to say the *Devils* were not once in state of *Grace*, and not bad; but seeing he cites nothing for it but the Authority of St. *Thomas*, sure he does not mean to make it undenyable: seeing St. *Thomas*'s authority is so professedly deny'd by his own Divines. And, as for the places of *Scripture*, seeing they are Allegorical, to build to nice a Verity as of the duration of one instant, upon corporal similitudes and comparisons is a weak Argument, (and as freely deny'd as affirmed. For the opinion it self, St. *Austin* and *Scotus* justify it from being erroneous or impossible, though where there are no other Arguments brought against it, it is superfluous to bring in Auxiliary forces.

5. In the thirteenth Number he urges the *Illumination of Angels*, and in the twelfth their *speaking to one another*, which both are explicated in my sacred Institutions. *Te. 2. A. 2. Lection 8.* and are too subtle questions to divulge in vulgar Languages. He presses farther, that the souls in *Limbo* just upon good Friday began their *Beatifical Vision*, though the Bodies rose not untill Sunday, and that it was not true upon *Maundy-thursday*

Thursday that *St. John Baptist's* soul was in Paradise, but on good Friday it was. If you are persuaded he had some special Revelations you may believe him. I must know some better proof before I be of his mind.

6. In his sixteenth Chapter he tells you, *that Moyses' soul spake with our Saviour, Mat. 27. Luke 9.* but the Scripture speaks of *Moyses*, Not of his *soul*; And *St. Thomas* will tell you that a soul can govern no body but its own; and so will make you think it was an Angel in the likeness of *Moyses* that spake to Christ. In his seventeenth he tells us that *the Devil did contend with St. Michael about Moyses' his Body*. He should have said *scolded*, for otherwise contention may be some outward action about the Body it self, and so nothing to us. Likewise he tells us that *Devils spake to Jeremiah by a new Act*. Indeed there is mention that *Devils* had a tongue; for otherwise we should have thought that story to be parabolical, and that there needed no new words to veil y^e it. Again he tells us *the Devil had a new Act by which he heard the voice of Enan's call for Samuels' soul*. This it is to be well acquainted with the Devil, so that he can tell what passes in his very breast. Whereas simple Divines like my self should have thought that

that it was not the *Devil*, but a good Angel which represented *Samuel* in that passage. Yet this will not serve me for he knows likewise what passes in the breasts of Angels, and so he tells us how *Raphael* by a new act did offer *Tobias* his prayers to God. But he should have expressed whether it was in a dish or a censer that he offered them, and likewise with what kind of rope or chain he tied up the *Devil*. Also what bustling there was for one and twenty days, between the two Angels of *Persia* and *Israel*. For I, that think all these expressions to be allegorical, and some of them at least done by outward and corporal actions, find no necessity of new acts in the Angels to any of these effects, no more then we are bound to put new acts in God Almighty when he is said to do so many new things of which the Scripture is full. As the Son of God to be incarnated, to create every day souls of new; to speak to our Saviour out of a cloud, and many such other things.

7. His Tediousness in multiplying divers particulars of the same kind, to which the same solution (that all the same things or the like are verif'd of God without any novelty in his acts) has quite wearied me, yet I cannot omit his last Argument, because it hath

hath something particular. He says then that the Devils sin did as first please them; but now these affections be their torturers; therefore he thinks they are repented, and have changed their acts, and adds, *Mark how you contradict your selves.* Mainly without doubt, seeing we say that the Devils were damned in the very instant of their creation, that is had all the same sorrows even during that *complacence*, and that they have still the same complacence with which they sinned, and that the very sinning is continued untill this very day, which is a Doctrine often repeated. By this you see how sleevelessly he puts me to trouble and to so much loss of time. His most solid Arguments are the Testimony of St. *Thomas*; in verity a great Doctour, yet such an one that it was never taken for a fault with modesty to refuse his sayings. Other Arguments are taken out of Tenets, for which are pleaded no more then some criticisms of the word *solus*, or some supposed *Antinomasia* excluding, if they be not well looked to and helped out by additions, known truths, as when the knowledge of chances to come, or the secrets of our hearts, is so verif'd of God as to exclude *Prophets*, unless you put in that they, or Devils, and Ange's, do not this by their

their natural power, which is not in the Text. Other Arguments rely upon the applying of Allegories to Angels, as if they were proper speeches. And whereas to a reasonable Divine this cannot be unknown, that we misapprehend Angels and their Actions, by our usual conceits and words, as we do likewise God, yet our Divine presereth the same things which are to be solved in God Almighty, as rigorously to prove a true change, as if he saw with his eyes all that pass in their breasts. And then cries out *he hath superabundantly demonstrated that in which the main difficulty lies*, when as he has not brought one word fit to come out of a Divines mouth in way of being a proof. Which revelation I do not impute unto him as a fault, for it is not his fault, but of that pitifull Topical counterfeiting of Divinity, used by them amongst whom he was instructed.

8. Now would it pity any Scholler to see him, when he has caught the word *time* by the end, as apply'd to that which hath no other reason to be called *time* but because we have no other names then of corporal things to design out spiritual qualities, (whereof though we want the true notions, yet we are forced to speak) so to play with the words, and insist upon the words of *true time*, shewing

ing plainly he understands neither what *time* is, nor what a *word* to be *true* means. For as for *time*, he will tell us that the motion of the Heavens are not true *time* N. 3. but that our *time* is measured by those motions, which is most unlearnedly spoken: Again he puts that there is an extrinsecal measure of Angels' intellections, in one part of which a proposition is true, and in another false: Again he tells us that Angels are not above *time* by their act, as if the duration of every Angelical Intellection did not hold up more parts of our *time*, and therefore must needs be higher then our *time*. But he will say they have a *time* of their own, and so cast us upon the other question what it signifies *Time* to be *true* which he understands as little, not knowing that in Analogical Terms, or such as are by design equivocal, no secondary sense, but onely the primary is the *true* sense of the word.

9. Out of this he proceeds N. 21. to exemplify in the Locality of Angels, in which he tells us that we know they are truly in a place in St. Thomas his Doctrine. Whereas St. Thomas tells us it is *per se natum sapienti- bus in corporalia non esse in loco*, That to wise men it is known of it self, or without need

of proof, that spirits are not in place. He concludes that men should content themselves to know that St. *Michael* was ever in Heaven, as properly as Christ descended in Hell. I must answer so they do, but that is to know that neither is properly spoken, no more then it is properly spoken, that the *Son of God* descended out of Heaven at his Incarnation: And, because they know that both are improperly spoken, therefore they endeavour to know in what sence they are spoken, that they may not chatter words without understanding, like Magpye, as is the use amongst his Divines. He adds it is no hard matter for a Scholler of ordinary capacity, to conceive the succession of Acts in Angels. Which is very true, but peradventure it is a hard matter to overcome that apprehension, and to see that Angels cannot be governed like Bodies, nor are to be apprehended to have such a succession. To the like purpose is it that he says, that our absurdities will be infinitely increased by putting that the acts of a spirit are her very substance. For the good man understands not, that the playstering and mason-like Philosophy he has been bred unto, is the most prostituted absurdity that can be taught.

110. Pag. 378. He begins to answer objections, and first this: that if there be no *irrisical change*, the torment cannot be greater for the passing of time: And he doth ingeniously confute it cannot: But when he comes to apply his Doctrine, he first advances this absurdity, that in our corporal torments there are no parts, but the same part of the torment is put in more parts of time: I do not wonder that an oversight might escape him, whom peradventure weariness had dulled; but that he had never a friend or overseer of his Book, that could tell him corporal torments were *various*, and had their divers parts proportion'd to the parts of time, I can hardly believe mine own eyes when I see it in his Book. I pray consider to what absurdities their positions leads them, it. The next absurdity is nothing less, though peradventure more cover'd. He grants that if there be no real change, there is no greater pain, and he puts that time purely makes no real change but what? it puts the same pain in a new time. Be it so. Where is the real change? in the pain? No, for you say it is the *same*: To be the *same* signifies *not change*. Where then? in the time? you say that adds nothing. Where then? in the putting of the *pain* to the *time*? He says not

not so: And it is plain that signifies but *permanence*, or that the pain is the *same* in a *new time*: Where, all novelty or change is in the *time*, and *newly* in the time: So that he puts both parts of the contradiction, the pain without change is no greater, and the pain without change is greater, and in marching of these lyes his solution.

11. After this he hopes it will not be hard to answer another objection he will put, and he has reason: For such solutions which admit both parts of a contradiction to be true, are most easy to be made, and impossible to be reply'd well against. But let us hear the objection. Saith the objectour, if two acts be indivisible, they cannot succeed one the other; but they will be together: This your Divine makes to be the objection, and answers, No they will not be together, but succeed one the other: And then says, *St. Thomas* well observes this, and that *Aristotle* for want of knowledge in Scripture knew not this; and that he has proved it by above a dozen better demonstrations, then this is often mis-called by that name. What can I say to this great Doctor? Whence your Divine hath taken this Argument I cannot remember, though my tancy gives that some where I have used Letters in this or some

like subject, but I cannot find the place. I find the substance of the Argument is in my twelfth Account of the Treatise of the *Middle State*. But there it is put in this Tenour, that seeing the act of a Spirit hath no parts, nor is capable of them, either it will dure but for onely one moment of our time, or else by its nature it will dure for ever. To dure for one moment of our time, is not to dure at all, for there are no instants in time or motion, for they signify nothing but the not-being of motion. Now if you assign a part of time in which this indivisible act continues, you give it a duration essentially above the nature of time, and therefore by its nature to endure all time, if not longer then time. There is added to this Argument this confirmation; suppose of two acts which begin together in divers Angels, one be put to dure longer then the other, without any real addition of duration, wherein can this consist? that is, it consists in nothing, and therefore is impossible, and Chimerical. Of this Argument he brings no more, then that of two acts succeeding, one must needs be together with the other, without any proof why; which makes me think he aym'd not to bring this Argument, though he professed to answer all

all he had ever heard of. By the form of the Argument as he relates it, the Authour of it seems to aym at this Conclusion, that two acts of the same Spirit cannot be disjoyned by an intermission or Cessation from all act, because there would be no *medium*: but this your Divine seems not to aym at. So that I can see nothing into this Argument, but that it is imperfectly related. Unless peradventure the Arguer takes the duration of Angelical acts to be purely Instantaneous, as are the instants of time; and your Divine speaks so ambiguously, that a man cannot understand by his words whether he ever look'd into that point, or desir'd to meddle with it. For *Aristotle* hath demonstrated that two such instants cannot be together; and that *St. Thomas* made no scruple to admit, though your Divine seems to contradict *Aristotle* in his Doctrin, which may easily be, for not understanding either *St. Thomas*, or the question, or the force of a Demonstration. As he plainly shews by bringing in *Zeno's* Errour, in comparision to *Aristotle's* demonstration, and saying that in *Aristotle's* way there be *insuperable difficulties*, which uses to be the saying of those who understand not this Demonstration

of *Aristotle*; which is fundamenta to
 Philosophy, and acknowledged by all
 who deserves the name of Philosophers.
 And so you may see I did well to promise
 him no demonstrations, who know not
 what they signify, but thinks every *Anthropomorphical* explication of Scripture to
 be *Demonstrative*.

But that is not the point I am now
 at. I am now at the point of the
 Angelical nature, as the Angels
 of time, and your Divine books do mani-
 festly, that a man cannot understand by
 his words whether he ever took down the
 point, or delin'd to middle with it. For
 Angels have demonstrated that two such
 instances cannot be together, and that
 I have made no scruple to admit, though
 your Divine books to contradict. **NOTH**
 I am now at the point, which may easily be for
 not understanding either. 22. Thomas
 of the question, or the force of a de-
 monstration. As the plainly shows by bring-
 ing in St. Thomas's reason, in comparison to St.
 Thomas's demonstration, and saying that in
 a plain way there is no way to be in doubt
 with the force of the demonstration
 who understand not this demonstration

EIGHTH DIVISION

Containing an Answer to his twenty third
and twenty fourth Chapters.

Our Opinion avouch'd by true Philosophy. His
Calumny of our Tenets. God's Government
of the Synagogue, different from that of the
Church. The notion of the word Morality.
The comarative of the pains we pay, and
the needlessness of his. The many ill-conse-
quences and absurdities of the Opinion, that
all Venial affections are blotted out by Con-
trition in the first Act of Separation. The
follies of his Opinion that souls in Purga-
tory cannot help themselves. His probable
Divinity. His non-sense that liability to
be punisht, without Fault, is a blessing
refus'd.

I cannot but complain of your Divinity
that having promised such wonders in
the last discuss'd Chapter, he came off so pi-
tifully, that where he had the advantage of
human apprehension against me, he gave me
not as much as occasion to explicate my Do-
ctrine, unless I should have gone and stray'd

from his Text. His oppositions were pure opinions without any sight of Evidence: His Authority for the most part of *St. Thomas*, from whom in this point we professedly recede. His Scripture such as he himself is bound to solve in respect of Almighty God, So that in its words it has no force, and all the force must come out of this, whether the nature of Angels requires to have the words explicated improperly or no, which he may suppose, but goes not about to prove, otherwise then from uncertain Authority: His solutions, to admit contradiction, or else propose some Argument by halves: The rest of his Chapter, high words.

2. Howsoever I hope his three and twentieth Chapter will make amends, for the question is not so Metaphysical as the other was. It begins with an explication of my Doctrin, disguis'd in high terms, yet true ones for the greatest part. In his second Number he accuseth it of being against Philosophy, to say that God so order'd all things in the beginning, that he need not since put his hand to it. By which if he understands that God doth not continue conserving of his creatures. It is not my Doctrin. If he grants Conservation to God, though the truth is that Conservation is but the very

Devotion and Reason. 249

Act of first Creation, though in name and notion it be divers, then I must see how he proves it against Philosophy. For (saith he) *no natural cause can produce the soul of a man*, and therefore God must do some new action when there is an exigence of creating a soul. I grant no creature can create a soul, but affirm that the first act of Creation creates every soul when time is, without farther or greater Influence of God. He may reply he understands not this. To which my answer is, that I beleeve him, but cannot help him, seeing it is not here place to explicate Mysteries of incident Philosophical points. He may help himself, if he pleases, with my *Institutiones* both *Peripatetica* and *Sacra*. He adds two other Philosophical necessities he finds: one of the necessity of Gods actual *concourse* with second causes, the other of Gods choosing *Individuums* for the second causes to produce. The former as far as it hath sence in it, is done by the Action of Creation or Conservation, by which God sets the Angels on work to move celestial Bodies, from whose motion actual motion flows into all other causes, and this is the true either premotion or concourse of God with creatures plain and visible. The other which I fear he means, hath no kind of Philosophy

lophy, nor Divinity in it. The choosing of *Individuums* is the rascallest, and the ridiculousst Position that ever was affirmed by any sort of Philosophers. You see what sound maxims he takes to impugne the perfection of God's Wisdom.

3. In his fourth Number he begins to employ his Divinity. And first he asks *what natural cause can raise dead bodies, and give them due torments?* And I must answer with a reply of a question; to wit, when this is to be done? While the Fabrick of Nature holds? or, when it is ended? If when it is ended, how comes it to our purpose? Or is not he grossly mistaken to put this amongst the workings of Nature. Yet that the course of Natural Causes does prepare the World even to this unmaking of Nature, you may find in the last book of my *Institutiones Sacrae*. For the proportionable pains, the Soul of themselves will cause those, as you may see in the same book. To fill up here a Page with his own opinion of Purgatory was besides the matter, for we doubt not but that he puts more *willfulness* then *wisdom* in God Almighty's Actions.

4. His main Answer begins N. 3. where he tells us, that it is *Herefit* to make natural causes to have virtue sufficient to bring man

by themselves alone to his final end of Eternal Bliss. And then he tells you, that our prime Argument is the same that Pelagius's, to wit, that every natural Agent might to have power given it from the Author of Nature, to bring it self to its natural perfection. But first I would enquire where he found in any Writing of mine the Proposition he condemns? If I say that God hath ordained second causes to do all effects, which are not to be seen to be miraculous, do I exclude supernatural causes? Are not Christ's coming and Preaching, the coming of the Holy Ghost, the Habits of Faith, Hope, and Charity, the Prayers, and Preaching, and good Works proceeding from men through such Habits, the Sacraments, the whole form of the Church, all Supernatural causes interwoven with natural? To what purpose then doth this man talk, that natural causes are not sufficient to bring a man to Heaven? Is it not plain he knows neither what I say, nor what himself? See how just our Argument is the same with the Pelagians? Out of this you see his Answer is like to be a good one, and so it is. For Num. 11. he hath, so I answer. His man's last end cannot be reached by Nature, so is it out of the reach of natural causes, by their natural operation.

tion, to chastise man's sinning proportionably to his voluntary acting against his supernatural end. My Reply is, that he must seek out to whom to answer, for I never talked of purely natural causes, but natural and supernatural together, as they compound all second causes. But the good man could think of no supernatural causes, but God himself working immediately, and so strayed to seek out why such actions were not miraculous, which we will not follow him to, because it is not concerning to our Theme.

5. Yet I may deliver one Doctrine, which I know not whether he has reflected on or no: which is, that before Christ, Miracles belonged to the Ordinary Government of the Church by God Almighty: since Christ and his Apostles time, these are become parts of Extraordinary Providence. This I speak by reason of his great insisting upon pains in the Old Testament, which followed not supernatural to the Jews. For no small part of the motives proposed to the Jews, were temporal Commodities, which are propounded unto Christians meerly as accidents, not to be sought for; according to that saying, *Querite primum regnum Dei & cetera adiciuntur vobis.* And St. James tells us, *Siquis indiget sapientia postulet a Deo & dabitur ei;*

ei; but for any thing else he does not tell us so: but we know they are sometimes granted, and sometimes denied. But in the Old Law the Prophets fore-told both punishments, and rewards, and they failed not: Now that sort of Government is turned into a better, and we have order to govern our selves by Reason, and Faith is given us to help and strengthen our Reason, that it may reach the motives propounded to us out of the state of the next World, and to expect rewards and punishments there which spring out of our lives here; according to the words of the Apostle, that Afflictions here do work glory in Heaven; and the other, that their works follow them. And this to those who use understanding Divinity is signified by the word *meritorium*. After this he makes a repetition of some Arguments many times told over; and at last Number 12. he tells us, that he never sayd, that after that God is in part pacified, there still remains in him a boyling of his fury not quite allayed: But (says he) we speak of a most just and rational proceeding in God, &c. What mood the good man was in, when he wrote this, I know not. For the words exprets, as if he meant, that *before* God is in part pacified, there were in God a boyling

boiling of fury, and not a just and rational proceeding.

6. I told you somewhat of the signification of this word *Meritorious*, but I fear I must eat it again. For in his 24. Chapter, Number second, he tells us, that when Nature, by Death, hath put a man out of this World, she hath put his soul out of her reach. &c. So that now in this state the nature of a meritorious cause appears to be consider'd by Divinity, and Aristotle his Philosophy must stand in great part out of doors. Farewel then poor Aristotle, and his philosophy. Yet because he is a Philosopher, he will ask a cause why he should be turn'd out of doors. Let us then look into this Mystery. If that a Work-man hath bestow'd a days work upon another man's ground, he receives at night what according to the manner of living in that Countrey, and the quality of the work, is esteem'd equal to his labour. If a Souldier in a Battle, or Siege, did eminent service towards the winning of the Battle, or Town, his General consults what is fitting to stir up others to dare the like, and the Souldier receives it. And both the *work-man* and the *Souldier* are sayd to have deserved their rewards. Another Work-man, for example a Watch-maker, makes a Watch, and hath it;

and the fruit of it, to know the hour of the day, but is not sayd to *deserve* the Watch. And another Souldier goes out upon his enemies, and getteth a good booty, and is not sayd to have *deserved* it. What is the reason of this variety of language? Why the latter used the *natural* causes of the effect, which by their own force produc'd it; The other got not this particular reward by a *natural*, but by a *rational* means, that is, by pleasing one in whose power it was to bestow it upon him. If this be well discoursed, then also concerning Soules rewards, if they be such as follow not out of the force of the disposition, which their works have made the Soul to have in the next world, but God by his arbitrary will determines to give them what he thinks best out of the General Principles by which he governs the World, these rewards will be sayd properly to be *deserved*. On the other side, if the rewards are necessarily consequent to the disposition on which the Soul departs out of her body, they will be properly called *Effect*, improperly to be *deserved*.

7. Applying this to our case, that is, to the pains of Purgatory, let us see what is to be said. And first I ask, what pains doth the fire of Purgatory inflict upon the Soules? I suppose

suppose your Divine will answer, *Griefs and Sorrows*. The next question, are the griefs of Objects that deserve to be grieved for, as it is fit for Holy Souls to have? I suppose he will again say, *Yes*. The third question, Would not she of her self have all those griefs? I think he cannot chuse but say *Yes*, and not put a *new fault* in the Souls not to have a grief which they *ought* to have. The fourth Question is, If she have this grief, is it not a *punishment* layd upon her by God, notwithstanding that it proceeds from their *natural* inclination, which God gave them, amongst other Reasons, to punish their faults? I know not what he can deny. The fifth Question, What then does the fire do? make the same over again, or increase it? The former answer is absur'd. To the later, we ask the sixth Question, Is not the grief of a holy and separate Soul *proportionable* to the offence or ill it did in this World? If it be, God's Justice requires no greater. If it be not, a probable cause must be rendred why a *less* sorrow would have quitted the Sin in life, and now such an *excess* will not: Or else, for any thing that I see, *Aristotle* will claim a share for his Reasons in the next World, as well as in this, which if your Di-

vine will grant us, we will in silence pass over his two first *N. N.*

8. In his third Number he cuts out a new piece of work to his friends, which is, that an *act of contrition* (which they put in the first instant) *of its nature taketh away pain, as well as guilt*; therefore, say we, it must take away the pains of *Purgatory*, if it hath there power to take away the *guilt*, as in this World it usually does, and would do, if that act were here done, seeing it springs out of the whole Heart and power of the Soul. His first answer is, that *Bellarmin* hath say'd much to this difficulty, which your Divine passes over with a *Besides*, and upon so good an authority I cannot doubt but that it deserves to be lay'd aside; His second Solution is out of Saint *Thomas*, which neither your Divine does stand to, nor as it seem Saint *Thomas* himself, making no mention of it in a later work, where he handleth the question largely. Wherefore omitting it, let us come to the third, which he says to be *not satisfactory*. Which I believe, if he takes *not* comparatively, for of the three it is the least faulty; but if he means *truly satisfactory*, he must first clear me a doubt or two, before I can be of his mind. First in it, is supposed, that we must necessarily say that *Venial Sins* are re-

mitted after this life: Which is true, but unless the time be specify'd, it may be at the Day of Judgment, and so nothing to our present question. What he adds that the remission of sin doth take away all impediment of going to Heaven, but abateth nothing of their pains, I do not understand for three Reasons. First because it is onely sayd, and no other cause rendred, but *because the state of merit ceaseth after this life*. But why to take away the guilt of sin, and the impediment of going to Heaven, is not the effect of merit, is not declared, and seems that it cannot be deny'd. Secondly, there is no reason given why it abateth nothing of the Souls pain. For why should this be accompted a merit more then the other? Seeing it increaseth not Charity, nor the reward of Charity, and is but a *removens prohibens*, as well as the other. Why then is one admitted, the other rejected? Thirdly, since the Council of Florence, it is not to be tolerated to say, that to a pure Soul remains any impediment of going to Heaven. And this answer puts the Soul to be pure.

9. Another difficulty I have about that Proposition, *We must hold that in the life to come, there is no essential change in the will; so wit, for that which belongs to the increase of Charity*;

Charity; First, about the Truth of it; For, I doubt not but by the Beatifical Vision whensoever it begins *Charity* is increased; and likewise, that at the re-union of our Bodies, *Charity* and the reward of it shall both increase. Neither do I take it to be spoken *consequenter* to put many acts of *Charity*, and not put them to increase the habit, though you put the acts to be of the same degree of intention. For we cannot deny but one and one makes two, and that two are more then one, and (*ad hominem*) if the same pain put in a new time, makes the pain greater, much more two acts of *Charity* are more *Charity*. If it be answered, the time of merit is pass'd. I reply then you must put no more merit, But with one breath to put merit, and cry the time of merit is pass'd, is to oblige us to believe Opposites.

10. A third difficulty I have, how it is prov'd that in Purgatory there is an act of *Charity* with detestation of a Venial sin inconsistent with the affection of Venial sin. For onely to say it is so, is not to answer the Argument, but to repeat your conclusion, or ask the question. It is confess'd by both parties, that *Charity*, not onely in *habit* but also in *act* stands with venial sin, for otherwise every time we make an act of *Charity*,

we should revoke our affection to Venial Objects. St. Thomas's known Doctrine is, that a will once taken resolutely in the new World is unchangeable, and truly that one act remains until a contrary be put out; We must therefore either say that the Soul hath a new deliberation at her going out of the body, or that she keeps the same she had in the body, until she return to it: If we put a *new deliberation*, it may be as well of the *End*, as of Venial Objects, and so the Soul shall change her state of Salvation after Death, and all place of merit will not be deny'd: It follows then that there can be no act in the Soul impossible to the affection of venial sin until Resurrection. Wherefore I doubt not but to a man of a not-preoccupied Judgment, this Answer will be so far from being satisfactory, that it will manifestly appear that the holders of your Divine's Opinion, as much as they cry up that there is no room for *merit* with one breath, so much they pull it down by their inconsequent positions on the other side. Besides another thing, which in a Divine is a manifest defect, that they render no rational cause of the impo:ency to merit, which in our opinion is most manifest.

11. In his sixth number he falls upon another question not properly against us, but amongst his own Divines, which I must a little rip up, because it so clearly shews the huge weakness of their Doctrine, and Doctrines. The Question arises out of this difficulty, that it seems inconsequent, that if the Souls in Purgatory may be helped by others they cannot be helped by themselves. And it is as true an absurdity as it seems to be, and rises out of the denying of our Opinion. He seems to give an answer, by saying, that *they have deserved in this life time to be helped in the next world.* But this doth rather aggravate the difficulty then solve it. For, it shews they are helpable, and then the difficulty is greater why they cannot help themselves: For to say it is precisely, because God will not give them leave to help themselves, is to call God unreasonable, and wilful and cruel, instead of playing the Divine, and giving an account why to do so, is conformable to God's Goodness and Government. But to fall to the Question; Some of their Doctrines seem to deny to the Souls of Purgatory power to *pray*, which how it can fall into a Christian's head, much less a Divine's, I am not capable. Are not the Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, *prayers*? Will

any body deny them these? Are not the acknowledgment of their sins, and the desire of forgiveness, *prayers*? Do they doubt of this? Can they *wish* the relaxation of torments from *men*, and not from *God*? How absurd a Position is this? that God whose whole endeavour is to bring mens hearts to *him*, should send abstracted Souls from *himself* to *men*? The very absurdity of this saying to an impartial man would condemn the whole Opinion: And yet more, that they can impetrate that the Living may pray for them, may impetrate Graces for the Living, but none for themselves: whereas we are taught, that God grants us easier for *our selves*, then for *other men*. These sayings are so empty of all Divinity, and Solidity, that depending as they do, meerly from this uncertain and unlikely ground of the Souls present delivery from Purgatory, they make it like to themselves, *uncertain*, and *unlikely* also.

12. In his seventh Number he tells us, that perhaps God was mov'd by his Justice to ordain, that the pains due in the other life be not ordinarily remitted, but by satisfaction made either by themselves or others. An excellent piece of Divinity, to ground so substantial a point, as whether the Souls in Purgatory pray

pray for themselves or no, which every man of any Judgment cannot doubt but that they can no more cease from doing, then they can cease from loving themselves, from hoping and desiring Beatitude, and from saying *adveniat Regnum tuum*, all this being nothing but praying for themselves. So learned are his Divines, who question and dispute this: Now to say such ardent prayers have no effect, is as great an absurdity on th' other side. The like is of that nonsensical division of Works into three as it were parts, and to say *quatenus* they are *impetratory* of pardon, they are not *satisfactory* for sin, or *quatenus* they are *meritorious* of grace: they are neither *impetratory* of remission of sin, nor *satisfactory* for it; a quibbling of terms, without ever weighing the signification of the words. Towards the end of his ninth Paragraph he says, that though some have *inconsiderately* sayd, that this Divinity is brought out of the Skultery, or Kitchen, yet it may be maintain'd as probable, even when a most rigorous exam'n shall be made of the Principles from which it is deduc'd. To which I reply, that he who sayd those words, will say again, that all such Opinions as have no more to plead for themselves, then that they may be maintained to be probable, are fitter for Skulteries,

lorges, and *Souls*, then for *Schools* and *Divinity*. For a Divinity should not advance any Opinion which he thought not he could make appear *certain* to any well-disposed understanding; though the Proposer might be deceiv'd in his confidence, and deserve pardon, as a Man, not an Angel; but what in his Conscience he does not perswade himself to be true, it is unworthily done to propose it for a Divinity conclusion; either to be taught in the Schools, or preached in Churches.

13. In his tenth Number he begins a new Objection, to wit, that because *pains* are neither *sin*, nor foulness or *blemish*, if there remains in Purgatory nothing but *pains* to be pay'd, nothing is there to be *purged*, and by consequence there is *no Purgatory*. This is the Objection; His Answer is, That when one sinneth, he committeth a fault, and gains the *Lyability* to be punished; that this *Lyability* is a *blemish*, and so there is somewhat to be purged, and by consequence a Purgatory truly so called. Our Proverb is, that an *old Dam* is not to be caught with *chaff*. Therefore I desire not to be bobbed off with *two words*, signifying the same thing, whereof one being affirm'd, the other deny'd, the Answer comes to be a pure contradiction. I know

know there is nothing more frequent in his Divines mouths, then the distinction of the guilt of *faults*, and the guilt of *pain*: But what meaning corresponds to these words, that is my difficulty. I look upon a mortal sin remitted by Contrition or Sacrament, and I see if any *pain* remains after Contrition presently men say his Contrition was not perfect, for had it been perfect, it would have quitted all the pain. Now the work of Contrition is by detestation, to expel the affection to the detested Object. I see therefore that some inclination to the same object remains, that is, some infection of sin, whenever all pain is not taken away by Contrition. Remission by Sacrament is held to be done by a weaker disposition then is to be found in perfect Contrition: Therefore, I doubt not but rather more dregs of sin remain in the Soul after the *Sacrament*, then when the sin is remitted by *pure contrition*. I see likewise a *satisfaction* requir'd in Penance, by which we seek to equal Contrition, and so greater pains also to be generally esteem'd to remain after Sacramental Absolution, then are thought to be left after Remission by a contrite heart: But in both I find dregs of sin left inwardly, besides the pains due exteriorly. Nor do I remember, that I have
had,

had any certainty of *pains* remitted without the *sin*: nor of *sin* remitted with *no pain* at all; for, the Councils specify directly that *in the remission of the sin all pain is not remitted*, but *some* to be is evident, in the remission of mortal sin, where eternal pains are acknowledged constantly to be remitted. So that looking into practice and things as far as we have any certainty, neither *pains* are remitted without *sin*, nor *sin* without *pains*. So we see the Church provide in Indulgences, that there go before Penance and other Acts, which are supposed to help to the Remission of sin.

14. Now let us look into the words. There is (say they) guilt or Lyability of *fault*, and guilt, or lyability to *punishment*. Here I note the impropriety of their Language, that in the same distinction they must change the phrase, from *Lyability of*, to *Lyability to*; a certain sign of imperfect Language, but necessary. For what could *lyability to fault* signify. Did any thing go before fault by which the Person was made lyable to commit the fault? Again, ask *why* a man deserves to be punished, which signifies the same, as *by what* he is lyable to punishment? is it not answer'd, because of such a fault; *fault* then signifies *lyability to punishment*; and

and *lyability to punishment* signifies *fault*. Does God or Man *do harm* to another by reason, unless he *wishes harm* to him? To *wish harm* to him, is not that to bear him ill-will? and can a fault be called pardoned or remitted, as long as God *wishes him harm*, and evil? Yes (say they) but a man may remit death to a man, and yet keep him in Prison, as we see *David* remitted his banishment to *Absalom*, yet for two years would not admit him to his sight. But is not this clearly not to be so angry *as before*, yet to be *somewhat* angry? What plain nonsense then do these Divines speak? And what a solid Solution do they give, when they tell you there remains *no fault*, but there remains a *lyability to be punished*? that is, as a Lawyer I have heard of used to say, when one told him what he knew to be false; it may be so (he would answer) but it is impossible. Such is our great Divine's distinction, and goodly subtilty. Further, this *lyability* either is in the sinner, or not? If not, how can it be *purged away*, or he *purified* from it? If it be, it must either be some *ill affection*, or some *natural quality*; Ill Affection is *sin*, a natural quality is not to be purged, seeing it is not hateful to God. In a word, it is senselesness to put *lyability* to be any

any thing that is neither *fin*, nor some extrinsecal denomination. Therefore nothing can be purged out of a Soul but *fin*. The Fathers plainly call it *Sin*, *Hay*, *Wood*. They talk of *consuming of Earthliness*, of *feeding upon manna*, and many such terms, which signify a real *subtraction* from the Soul, and not onely of *smearing*, as the Divine would persuade us.

NINTH

NINTH DIVISION.

Containing an Answer to his three last Chapters.

His Gross Error concerning the Efficacy of Almes, deeds to remit Sin. His needless Repetitions; his blundering in one Council, and open abuse of another, and of his Adversary's Text. The publishing uncertain Revelations punisht by the Church with Excommunication. The efficacy of Prayer in common, and to what tis efficacious, particularly of those Prayers, which are made for the Dead. The Charity and Prudence of the Demour, not the exterior Action awaiting him. That the impetratory power of Masses is to be weighed by the Charity of the Priest who says them, not by their multitude said indifferently by any, or the external Action. How the Mass is the most efficacious Prayer. The Churches Prayers, and practice in Foundations opposite to him.

1. **H**is twenty fifth Chapter is made up of Repetitions of what is before said, and therefore to avoid your trouble, and mine

mine own, I say at once that we have already answered the most part of it. Yet we must see whether he hath not sprinkled some new aspersions on our Doctrin. When I object that *Scriptures teach us to pray for remission of Sins of the dead*, He answers it means the *Liability to punishment*, which is lately confuted. He brings some places of Scripture in which he pretends the remission of *onely pain* to be signify'd by the remission of *Sin*. The answer to one will clear all. He cites the giving of Almes to quit sin, and proves out of *St. Paul* that giving of Almes is to no purpose but to avoid pain. A fould errour for the *Alms-deeds* *St. Paul* speaks of are done *without Charity*, and so according to his own Doctours cannot remit pain, and *St. Paul* expresses that they are *nothing worth*, which would be false if they could remit the pain due to sin. When as our Saviour teaches us *dare Eleemosynam & omnia vobis munda sunt*, he means as they ought to be given, to wit, out of Charity, for *Charitas operit multitudinem peccatorum*, not onely as to pain, but as to fault. And as in this, so in all the places he cites, if the works be done as they should be done, they remit sins, by being joyned to a good heart, and without that conjunction they remit nothing.

- 2. In his sixth Number he seems to charge me to hold that souls are in *suspence* until the day of Judgment. But he knows I hold no such thing, and am bound to explicate the Fathers who seem to favour that way as well as he. From hence to the eleventh Number are three Repetitions, saving a place of *Genadium*, whom as yet I have not found. In his eleventh Number he hath this proposition. *It is the unquestioned Doctrine of the Church, that a soul truly penitent hath that Charity which Scriptures, Councils, and Fathers hold to be requisite to Beatitude, and to suffice therunto in its rank.* This is a blundering, equivocal, and blinding proposition. For if *truly penitent* signifies of all *Venial sin* and fully penitent, the proposition is true, but nothing to the Council of *Florence*, which speaks not of such; and, how often doth he himself put people to dy in *Venial sin*, whom he will not deny to have *Charity sufficient in its rank to Beatitude*, and will not deny that the Council of *Florence* speaks of such, and of these it is nevertheless certain they have not that Charity which is necessary out of its own force to bring them to Bliss. So that the word *Truly penitent* must be distinguished to make any clear sence, and likewise *sufficient Charity*; or else he blunders and speaks

speaks words without any certain meaning.

4. The twelfth and thirteenth Numbers have nothing not before confuted. In the fourteenth he seems to acknowledge it lawfull to be held, which before he had called a *gross Error*, that the Pope defin'd but *one question*, though with *many branches*, which was never deny'd. Nothing more but Repetitions.

4. In his fifteenth there is a slipperiness worth the noting. For repeating an Argument in which the main force stood in the word *difference*; In the answer he turneth to *debate*, and solves the Argument by saying there was *no debate*, which was the very thing that the Argument aim'd at: Whose force is this. About the Ante-judiciary delivery there was a *difference* between the Greek and Latin Fathers in the Council of *Florence*, but *no debate*; therefore it was not thought a matter worth *debating*. His answer is, *there was no debate, therefore this flashing Demonstration is evaporated into smoke*.

5. I beleeve the remaining Chapters will be of the same tenour. Yet in Chap. 26. N. 2. I must note, that the Testament of *St. Ephrem* (as indeed all his works we have)

is uncertain. For St Hierom notes in his works *sublime Ingenium*, a lofty xi. The works we have are accounted *piu sed non dicta*. This Testament which is cited contradicts his narration of his conversion, so that we cannot judge whether of the two is true; or, if either be, we have them from such uncertain Authority.

¶ 6. Likewise Nr 3. your Divine adds to the Council of *Salcedo* by virtue of interpretation bequeathed to *Monasteries* to recommend the souls of those who had left these Legacies unto them; whereas in the Council there is no more then that such Legacies were given for the good of the donors soul which speaks much less.

¶ 7. I leapt over the former number arbitrarily, not marking one proposition which is, *This is certain*, that either those whom the Church worships for Saints have been the most deluded Persons that ever lived upon the Earth, or else many things in this kind are true, which some are pleased very freely to *corrupt*. When he spake before was of Revelations, Apparitions, and Visions; so that he would make his Reader believe we admitted some of all these, whereas himself concludes presently after, that exceeding great caution must be used in crediting things of this nature

after a narrow and judicious examin. He adds
In which though some writer have not been so
punctual, yet it will be a great discredit to Gods
Church to say that all of them have been Uni-
versally to blame in this point. I pray mark
how venomously he is malicious against his
own conscience. He cannot doubt but that
we admit of many Visions, Apparitions, and
Revelations: He finds nothing in my wri-
tings but conformable to his own saying,
that exceeding great caution is to be used: He
finds me except against none, in which there
is not either plain absurdity, or at least in
which I suppose to find ill Divinity, and as he
professes of me, that I think to demonstrate
it. And yet will he perswade his Reader
that I am an enemy to all. One thing it is to
admit Historical relations in the degree of
History, which their nature is capable of,
and another thing to set them up upon so
high a throne as to command Divinity; this
is that I refuse. Though I blame not him
for thinking that no man is able to discourse
like a Doctor about Visions and Revela-
tions without great danger of Erring, un-
less God hath made him partaker of such ex-
traordinary favours, because he speaks ac-
cording to his pitch; yet I may take the
boldness to tell him he knows not what he
says,

says, and in this temerarious proposition, he wrongs all Universities, and learned men; and the very Science of Divinity it self; All Prelates of the Church, not excluding the Pope himself; none of these in their qualities and degrees by which they are Judges of Christian demeanour, pretending the extraordinary favours he requires to make them speak like Doctours. I wonder he is not acquainted with the Bull of *Leo* the tenth beginning *Supernæ Majestatis*: In which he lays *Excommunication* upon all Preachers who in their Sermons do lay forth any such Visions or Revelations before they are approved by the Church, because ordinarily they are but Illusions of Melancholy Persons, who in their prayer have conceived such dreams, and imposed them upon their Directors. I pray perswade him to consider how much worse it is to *preach* such things, then to *point* them in a vulgar Language, by which they run amongst the unlearned sort, and consider how far he and the divulgers of his Book are from deserving *Excommunication*. Again, how many of these Visions in particular have passed the Examín, and approbation of the Church, for which they may not be accounted the *dreams* of waking men?

8. To return now to our former course in his third Paragraph he cites the 63 Canon of the Council of *Nice*, the which though it be known to be none of the Council, yet because the custom it speaks of is laudable, I except not against it. For we doubt not but the multiplication of prayers is ever good; *St. Paul* hath taught us that; but the question is onely of the *end* for which the custom was instituted. Yet I may note this, that peradventure your Divine is mistaken in the number, for we find in the first ages, that though there were forty Priests in a Church, onely one said Mass upon private days. But it is a tedious thing to walk in the dark, and to handle a question whereof the Roots are not understood. Wherefore I shall to my power lay down the grounds of the question, out of which Authorities may be the better understood.

9. There are therefore two questions to be display'd, the one *whereon* relys the efficacy of Prayer; the second to *what* it is efficacious. First therefore we must note, that this word *prayer* hath two significations. In the one it is nothing but the *praising* of God, in the other it signifies the *begging* something of God. Prayer in the first signification chiefly consists in the acts of the Theological vertues. By Faith and the qualities consequent to Faith, we acknowledg and

admire the attributes of God, and the perfection of his works, & so break out into those motions which follow such Acts. By Hope and Charity we love and desire God as our proper good, whether by his Essence, or by and his Creatures. Out of this follows that we ask him what we apprehend as necessary to us, in which consists that prayer which is properly called *Petition*. Now let us consider God as we would consider a wise man, and we shall see that if we beg any thing of a wise man, he considers two things; one is whether the Petition be convenient for it self; which if he finds, without difficulty he grants it: The other is, that though it be not convenient in it self, yet he considers, whether the friendship of the Person who begs it, makes it convenient to be done or no; And if he find it does, he grants the request. So then likewise must we esteem of God, that he doth what is beg'd of him, because of it self it is fitting to do it, even if there had been no prayers. At other times it is not good unless it had been begged. Further in the Beggar we find two Considerations; one of the Person, the other of the Begging. This later consideration is not considerable before God, more then as it makes the Person more acceptable. For who-soever begs of God, addressses himself to

T 3

God;

God: and, by that, exercises some vertue, for which he comes to be more acceptable. But then the begging obtains because of the worth of the Person: Abstract from this, and begging is but the affection to a created thing, and so hath more imperfection then perfection in it, unless it be the desire of what is commanded us: as when it is said *Quærite Regnum Dei*, and again, *si quis indiget sapientia postulet a Deo*. And it is added *in fide nihil hesitant*, which if I be not mistaken, signifies that he shall certainly be heard. Of other things we hear *Pater vester scit quia his omnibus opus habetis*, and if we will nevertheless ask them we have the form shaped out to us, *sed tua voluntas fiat, non mea*.

ro. That this explication of Gods hearing our prayers is true, depends of the Principles long since explicated, that God under forsett of his Wisdome and Goodness is bound to do what is best for his creatures, and nothing else; Wherefore what he does is either therefore best because begg'd, or of it self: therefore on one of these motives to be granted. Now if it be best because begged, since the title of begging is the favour the Beggar has, he must by the act of begging be in greater favour then without it; for if it had been convenient otherwise,

it would have been done without begging; and so not for the begging; for God needs no Monitor to tell him what and when it is best. And so you have the first point clear'd that Charity, and onely Charity on the Beggars part is the *cause* of the effect.

2^d. The other point was *what* God grants in respect of our prayers. That is to what our prayers are efficacious. In which the first proposition is that God grants nothing upon our prayers but what first he stirs us up to pray for, and ordains our prayers to be causes of the effect: the which is both evident of it self, and formerly declared. The next proposition is, that God stirs up no body to pray for any thing, unless the action of praying be good to him that prays; So that, whether the effect be granted or not, the good of praying never fails him who prays. A third proposition is, that all things consider'd, no extrinsecal good is the good of the man who prays for it, but is absolutely indifferent whether it be the spiritual good of Father and Mother, or Children, or whatsoever it be; and therefore by a perfect soul none of those things is to be absolutely pray'd for, or desired, but onely under the goodwill and providence of God. This is clear also to all those who understand

the nature of *Good* to be *respective* to him who desires it; and that it signifies what according to reason is to be desired by him; and, that every man is a part of the World, and cannot with reason desire the World should be conformable to him, and therefore may or must desire his own good, because he is made for it, and hath that charge from the Authour of nature to procure it, and be solicitous of it; But, as his Beatitude is but the end of him, so the Beatitude of others how near soever bound to him, hinders nothing the consecution of his Beatitude, and so is desirable no farther then the procuring of it is the best means to gain his own; and that is by desiring of it wholly indifferently as concerning the providence of Almighty God.

12. A fourth proposition is, that the desiring or praying for the goods of others is many times good for us when the obtaining it is our good, to wit, when we are not rational enough to abstain from wishing, and desiring such a good; For then our desire of such a temporal or accidental good hath the strength to make us lift up our Hearts to God, and exercise Acts of Verme, which is a great good to us, when peradventure if the effect were granted us it might be our harm or destruction. A fifth proposition follows

follows out of these, that there is no certainty of effect when we pray for others, unless we pray for known goods, and undoubtedly conformable to Gods providence; such as are the good spiritual and temporal of the Church in common, or else we have some particular instant from God Almighty to pray for such a thing in particular, the which peradventure happens oftener then our selves know, or can give account of. The conclusion is clear. For, seeing all other Goods are indifferent, and depending from Gods providence, and onely these kind of goods determin'd to us to be under Gods providence we can have no certainty of the grant of others, seeing we have no warrant of being heard for any but for our own good, as the experience of so often missing the effect of our prayers when we pray for temporal things, do put out of all doubt. And for any man to contend that our prayers are still heard where we cannot perceive whether they be or no, though it be evident in things where we have experience that the event is very uncertain, is to play the Juggler, as Astrologers and other Fortune-tellers do, and to be contemned and condemned.

¶ 1173. Coming now to apply this Doctrin to our question. As it is certain that pray-

ers for the dead is common have effect, so
 to come to particulars, and to say that it hath
 effect upon *this* soul, or *that* soul, is wholly
 uncertain, but certain it is that it hath good
 effect upon *him that prays*. Therefore clear
 it is that prayers for the dead are to be re-
 commended to the faithfull for the living's
 sake. For it is a clear case, it doth a great
 deal of good upon them. It puts them in
 mind of death, of Judgment, of hope of Re-
 surrection, and loving it, where they shall
 meet their friends, and towards which alone
 they can assist their friends. It makes them
 see and loath the Vanity of the World, out
 of which they lose their friends, and see that
 they must have their time to follow and quit
 all this good which here delights them. It
 makes them love their friends and kins-folks
 or children more spiritually. And, because
 it hath all these effects the stronger, how
 more vehement their affection is to their
 deceased friends, therefore they are to be
 more incited to pray for them then for o-
 thers. But because mans nature is framed so
 as to expect an effect of his prayer, God
 hath not left us without hope of great goods
 to our friends in the day of Judgment by
 our prayer, and the Church likewise in all
 her offices puts us in mind of it, and to pray
 whatsoever

whatsoever faults our friends carry out of this World, they may be all forgiven *then*, That day comprehends all Gods gifts from death forwards. It is the full of Christian hopes and desires. Fear not, that if there be any good to be granted *before this day*, but that praying for *this day*, you pray for it. It is all preparation to this day, and if it go before it shall not be lost for this days coming so late. But, praying for this day, we pray for what we *know*, our hopes are *certain*, we shall not find our expectations deceived. Those who aim at receiving good in the mean while, trust upon promises no where given, upon the presumption of men speaking without ground, upon a hazard: as if the goods which are *certainly* promised, were not enough to satisfy the longing of mans natural Appetite. The teachers play with their Auditors, as Nurses do with Children, tell them lyes to still them untill their longing be passed, and then care not whether it prove true or false. This is not Christs way who is Verity it self, this is not the Churches way which is the Pillar of truth, but the inventions of such as would dandle weak souls with a *present* content.

14. It is time now to look into what your Divine objects, for he seems to be in choler. He tells

tells us we use loud exclamations, purposely to cool the laudable practise of such, who by their Will and Testament leave a strict obligation to their Executors to procure the next morning, or as soon as may be, all those Sacrifices to be offered, which they intend for the relief of their souls, though they should be thousands; yea, though they should take no special order to have many offered after that time. He does as he was wont to do, and as Don Quixot gave him example, to mingle some false, and some true to shadow the false. For the multitude of Masses I no wayes dislike, so the intention and practise be right, and conformable to the Circumstances that the Church requires. That which I dislike is, that the practise of huddling up of Masses seems to make a great dependance on the Execution of the work more then on the Charity of the Donour. If the Action of the Donour be out of Charity and discretion, I make no difference, as to that consideration taken alone, whether the Masses be sayd in three days, or three years. I do not believe God's fore-sight is so short, that he cannot accept of that this day which is ordered to be done three years after. I depend not from the explication taken out of the Authour of the *Supplement*, whatsoever later

Divines

Divines follow it. I pronounce, the Masses to do so much more good to the Soul, the more good they do to the Church of God, and the Priests who say them. No man can deny, but the Action of causing so many Masses to be sayd is the better, by how much wiser and commodiouser it is. I expect the profit of the Soul from *Charity* and *Prudence*. Therefore I conclude, where there is more *Charity* and *Prudence*, there is also more profit to the Soul. As your Divine has read, *Make unto your selves friends of the Mammon of Iniquity*; so I have read, *That the poor Widow offered more than the rich men*. And shall I not think that her two Mites redeem'd more pain due to sin, then the Sacrifices which were made by the Rich-mens Gubbs? He that will teach otherwise, let him seek other Auditors, I will not be of his School. I believe that the poor man who gives but a shilling, or has but the hearty will to do what were fitting for the Church of God towards the good of his Soul, shall find as much relief as the rich man, who distributes an hundred pound in all haste for four thousand Masses. Yet do I not say the like to rich men. For in a Rich man, a small thing is no *Charity*; The *Charity* which dilates not his heart towards his Neighbour

is no Charity; to give that which he would not stoop to take up, is no Charity. If what he gives be not sensible to him, if it doth not diminish his love to Money; if greediness doth not miss it, it is no Charity. Therefore the Richer man must give more than the less Rich or poorer, that it may do him first good in this life, and thereby to his Soul in the next.

15. He Objects, that if the Opinion which hath prevailed for five hundred years be true, it cannot be but solid prudence, to procure the Soul's delivery as soon as may be. But he mistakes the question, which is not *whether* the Soul be deliverable before the Day of Judgment, but *by what means* she comes to gain the good she may receive; Whether by the pure execution of the External action, or by the internal Charity; which is, where it can be, the necessary and unfailing cause of the exterior act. And, as for the opinion that the external act gains the remission, I am afraid it is subject to that curse, *Pecunia tua sit tecum in perditionem*. For who can doubt but the remission of sin or pain; and the coming to Heaven are *Dona Dei*, and cannot *pecunia possideri*. I abhor to hear, that where there is no difference of Charity and internal goodness, there should be a dif-

difference in remission of sins, and purchasing of Heaven. Now in this huddling of Masses, regularly there is less *internal* vertue, then when they are dispensed with choice and commodity of the Church.

¶ 16. By what is sayd, his second and third Arguments are annulled; for, the value of the gift, and the good of the Soul is the same, whether the Masses be sayd a hundred years hence, or upon the obit day, or even not at all, so there be no fault in the Donour. And if you object, that then the Prayers are not sayd; I answer, that is an harm to those who should have sayd them, and peradventure to the Church, if God's Providence doth not supply it other ways, but no hurt to the Donour, whose work, that is the *Providence* and *Charity* by which he ordered it, shall follow him, and procure by their own strength what is due to him. What then? Do the prayers no good, or impetrate nothing to him? We know that impetration for others is *uncertain*, depending from God's Providence, no ways due to the prayers, but as much, and how, and when they agree to God's Providence; and therefore not to be rely'd upon for any effect; but every one must look to bear his own burthen, and to receive according to his deserts. He tells us

in

in the end of his fourth Paragraph, that if he had ten thousand pounds at his death, to leave for his Souls good, he *would expressly order* that none should be touch'd by them, who think it indifferent whether they pray for him this year, or next, &c. I answer, that I am of that mind also. For, who will take Alms must follow the Donour's conditions, not his own knowledg. But if I had but five shillings to leave for Masse; I would rather seek out the Priest on whom I thought it best employ'd, though he should say never a Mass for it, then another who had a priviledge to say two Masses that very morning, but who was not so prudently relieved by my Alms. It was my fortune to have recommended to me by a Gentlewoman upon her Death-bed, about 4 l. for the good of her Soul. She dy'd in poverty, in a strange Countrey, yet had saved this to be prayed for, according to the course of Piety she had been instructed in. She had a Child to be put to Nurse, without means to pay for the nursing. I openly confess, I procur'd her not one Mass in vertue of her money, but caus'd it all to be bestow'd on the keeping of the Child; out of opinion, that in this I did supply the *impudence* of the Mother, and that to do so, was to employ the money best for the Soul of the Mother

Mother: And such a mind I pray God I may have for my self at my death, if I have any thing to leave, to make my last Act of the greatest Charity to my Neighbour that I can, and I hope I shall do mine own Soul the greatest good that lyes in my power, to do by disposing of Temporal Goods.

17. In his fifth and sixth Paragraphs, he makes that Souls are chiefly to be helped by the Sacrifice of the Mass, according to the Council of Trent: But if one can help (saith he) many much more. What (says he) can be deny'd by any Catholick? I answer easily, that nothing is to be deny'd, but something to be understood. And first, because that out of the Principle lay'd, Charity is the ground of all impetration, therefore to understand how it is true, that the Mass is the greatest help for souls in purgatory, we ought to understand how the Mass is the greatest act of Charity: Which to do, we must remember the Mass to have these two relations. The one, that it is the Christian Sacrifice: The other, that it is the Commemoration of the Passion of our Saviour. The first Consideration stirs up our Intellectual power towards the Admiration, and Adoration of his Essence, and Thanksgiving for all the benefits which we have received, and

are to receive from his Almighty hand, and
 to vow all our love and affection to him up-
 on that score. The latter stirs up the man,
 the Compound of Reason and Passion, to
 the apprehension and esteem of the Mystery
 of our Redemption, of the good received by
 it, and of the penal course Christ took to do
 us this good. Both these considerations are
 help'd, by an awful reverence to the Action
 we do of handling Christ's own real Body,
 and of presenting to God, not our temporall
 goods, as in Alms, nor our own bodies, as in
 Penal Exercises, but the true and real Body
 of *Jesus Christ*, accompany'd with his Soul
 and Divinity. If all this raises not Charity
 to the height that Charity can have in this
 life, it is not the fault of the *Work*, but of
 the *Person*. Wherefore clearly, if Souls can
 be helped by nothing but *Prayers*, and that
Alms-deeds, and *Satisfactions*, can have no
 place but as they are *Suffrages*, or impetra-
 tions, who can require greater evidence, that
 of all exterior actions, the Mass of its na-
 ture, is the most impetrative and helpful to
 the deceased faithful? But presently you see
 that Masses are to be *weighed*, not *numbered*,
 to increase the power of prevailing. I might
 add to all this, that the very procuring of
 Masses is the greatest Act of Charity that a
 Lay-

Lay-man can do, speaking of exterior acts, and regularly. For the procuring of Masses, discreetly performed, and of its own nature, works not onely that Priests be maintain'd, but also makes them devout and good. The goodness of the Priest is the very health and happiness of the Parish. The Spiritual good of the Parish, is the greatest good that, speaking of regular and not extraordinary heroicall Works, is found in Man's life; therefore the procuring of Masses, is the greatest extern Charity, that any private Lay-man can do; when it is done with prudence and discretion.

28. I believe the rest of this Chapter is already answered. For, we scoff not at the multitude of Masses, but at the indiscretion of using them, and procuring them. Nor do your Arguments perswade us, that Rich men are in any thing in better state then the Poor, not onely for accidental considerations, but for the very substance. The Rich may do greater acts of Charity, but not acts of greater Charity; they may relieve other Bodies and Souls more then poor men, but poor men have as much power to help their own as the richest. The Rich may procure more to pray for them, but the Poor can pray for themselves as well as the Rich; which is the

certain and essential good. And, if you ask me, whether these be not great enticements of Avarice, I answer, no Avarice but keeps its goods until death; these men, for the most part, do their Alms while they live, which makes no Avarice, though they should procure Riches for such an end, the which I believe is rare. Our Wise-men have a saying, *I will make my own Hands my Executors, and my Eyes my Overseers.* Whose Estates permit them, this is their way, for this perfects the heart, extirpates or moderates the love of Temporalities in them, which is the main good. But the hope of good, by what Nature takes away from them, leaves the desires as great as ever to the last gasp. St. *Austin* advances an Opinion, that he who fears God, and behaves himself like a Christian, onely upon the fear of Torments in the next World, is no good Christian, and shall not reach to Heaven. He says it is the love of Heaven, and not the fear of Hell, makes a good Christian. I will not interpose my verdict in this Controversie: but will not he say the like of those, who onely for fear of the pains of Purgatory, part with their Goods to the Church, when they cannot keep them, when by Nature, they are their Heirs Goods, not theirs; Will he not say, it

is not act done out of Charity, and therefore doth them no good? And as for the prayers of them who pray for the Donour, besides the uncertainty of *whether, how, and when* they shall have effect, let us but reflect, that we cannot doubt but that if prayers can do the effect, they cannot want the prayers of all Saints and Angels, which must needs be more acceptable then ours. But the difference is, that they pray for nothing but what they know shall take effect by their prayers, because they see what God's Providence and determination bears. We pray blindly, and many times for that which is not decreed by the Eternal Providence, and so cannot be granted. And this many times thorough concupiscence, like to St. James's phrase, *Petitis et non accipitis, quia petitio vestra in concupiscentiis vestris insinuat.* So do we through natural desires or love, without sufficient reflection, and so give cause on our own parts, to be deny'd.

19. In his eleventh Number, he answers the abuse of multiplying Priests to serve in dead Masses to the devotion of the people, by saying, that if the Decrees of the Council of Trent were observed, notwithstanding these Opinions, Priests would not be over multiplied. The which, as I will not contest, so I may

well say, your Divine doth not consider that the maintaining of these Opinions; is the cause why the Orders of the Councils can not be observ'd, thorough the importunity of credulous People; which leaves our Bishops free to look to the observation of the Holy instituted Canons; chiefly to this; *Incerta sunt & quæ species falsæ laborant evulgari ac tractari non permittuntur.* The Council forbids uncertain opinions to be handled before the People, your Divine teaches the People to leave the Ancient and Apostolical devotion to pray for a happy Day of Resurrection; to fix their thoughts upon the misery of being freed from imaginary pains; which the Holy St. Catharine of Genoa commended by my Adversaries for one of the most illuminate Saints of our Age says they *shall not be freed from, but by satisfying God's Justice.* Towards the end, he delivers a speech of *Genoa*, to say that it (whatsoever that relates, for he doth not declare it) but I think is praying for the Dead) was not decreed, that the Priests might thereby gain their maintenance; but for the good of the Dead; which is to be understood with discretion, as not to deny the one, but to prefer the other. For seeing St. Paul, and God himself tells us, that the priests are to live by

by the service of the Altar it would be a very unadvised speech to deny the maintenance of Priests to be a secondary intention of the Church, though the first and chiefest were the good of the Dead.

20. He begins his last Chapter with telling us how *invincible Argument* he has brought out the practice of the Church, which makes me think the good man means honestly, and verily perswades himself he hath done wonders. His Arguments, and my Answer, may be compared together and the Reader thereupon give judgment. As to what is particular in this Chapter, in his second Number he, not content with the translation made before him of those words, *Deum fac Remissionem*, himself mends it so, *Tibi Pardonis grant not to delay until the last accounting day*. Where he puts in the word, *last*, and instead of saying, *Give Pardon* he puts *not to delay the Pardon*. The which though they leave the true sense, yet they change the face of the speech, and make shew as if until the very *last* day there were place for remission, of which, in the *Latin* there is no appearance, but only a desire of pardon while time is, to wit, in *this life*, insinuating nothing whither *after death* there is place for Pardon until the Day of Judgment.

ment or no, which his words make shew of, such craft there is in dawbing.

21. He seeks many ways of solving the plain prayers of the Church, as saying the Church imagins this to be yet before the Soul is departed, or that they are not spoken by the Dead, but by him who prays. And I cannot deny, that if such explications be admitted to be the explications of men who proceed sincerely to understand the mind of the Church, and not who seek to draw the words of the Church to their own Errour, any words may be so coloured. As I remember, my Master of Philosophy taught all to explicate *Aristotle* when he was against us, by saying *Aristoteles loquitur cum vulgo*. But if this be an unworthy practise, let us see what his fourth Number offers us. - To wit, that, whereas we object to them how the whole face of the Churches prayers is directed to the Day of Judgment, and not one word intimated of remission of pains *before that day*, which is an irrefragable testimony of the Churches meaning; he seeks to retort the same Argument, by saying, Why does not the Church pray for the acceleration of the Day of Judgment? To which we answer, she does it perpetually. For he that prays for good at the Day of Judgment, prays

prays for the Day of Judgment, and he that prays for the Day of Judgments coming, prays it may come as soon as possibly: So that the Church prays perpetually for it, when she prays for the Dead, but their fixeness on their Opinion permits them not to see it.

12. In his fifth Number he answers our Argument from *Foundations*, for prayers until the Day of Judgment, because those who made them were notoriously of their Opinion opposite to ours. But we must expect more ground to believe that. For such Foundations are sayd to be in *France* ever since the Children of *Charles* the Great's time, who were instructed by *Alcuin*. And therefore were of his and our *English* *Sax*-on Opinion: And later Foundations were made by the imitation of the former; and though, since the University of *Paris* got a great Vogue, this new Opinion hath been amongst the Doctors, yet it cannot be doubted but for a great while the Churches governed themselves by their ancient Customs, and by little and little admitted the Opinions of learned men: Wherefore it is not to be admitted without proof, that the Authours of perpetual Foundations proceeded out of an Opinion contrary to their practice.

practice. He wonders how the Church should prefix a time to praying for the same soul. I answer by Revelation, if she did except of Opinions by private Revelations, for why might not some Saint have a Revelation on that no Soul lay in Purgatory more then 100 years, as well as that such a Soul lay but three days. What discretion of Prelates can provide, that particular souls may have proportionable prayers. I understand not for where there is not knowledge enough to found a ghost, there discretion has no place.

22. Here we might have made an End, had not a saying of our Holy Bishop of Rochester stuck in his stomach. I do not remember where I have made use of that place. But I see find to what purpose he brings it, more then to frame an irreverent Interpretation of his own, and impose it upon me, and to take occasion to leave the Reader's mouth season'd with a scandalous calumny against me, as if that I favour'd Luther. Whereas it is one of the greatest signs of Truth to be betwixt two opposite Errors. Luther's and his; and therefore no wonder, if he cryes it smells of Luther's Doctrine, as ever the middle Truth is wont to be calumniated by the extreme Errors. He repeats here that I deny

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

S I R,

I have received the second part of Mr. M's remembrance to pray for the dead; but to what purpose you sent it I do not know. I cast my view over it, and find it divided into two parts; The one contains the Motives of praying for the dead, the second the Practice.

As to the first, saying that he supposes his falsity for truth, and the Divines imagination of the separable virtues of *Satisfaction* and *Merit*, and *Impetration* in every charitable act, which hath been sufficiently discoursed of, his whole Doctrine is common to both opinions. The proper Motives are contained in the three first Chapters, in which there is no difference more than some applications of the same words diversly.

The seven following Chapters comprehend Motives common to all charitable actions; and so, unless it be in some considerable passages, are common to all good books that exhort to any good work.

The five last Chapters lay forth a petty manner of devotion, fit enough for weak souls.

souls, and therefore not to be hindered. What he says of Indulgences hath been twice answered in the book. Some things there are in these last Chapters which deserve to be excepted against; but, because they require the declaration of some Principles of Devotion, which I have not as yet explicated, I hold it better to speak nothing then to speak without profit. Those who understand any thing of devotion and perfection, know that Charity is the end of it all; and therefore know that those good acts, whatsoever they be, that increase Charity in our own souls, are the best; and that Charity is the love of God, or of Bliss, for so St. Thomas, out of St. Austin, defines Charity that it is *motus Animi ad Deum ut fruendum*. The minds moving it self to the enjoyment of God. Who then will understand what acts are best, let him consider how much they advance this Love of God; and whether he be onely a Christian, or also a Directour, let him select to his charge such actions, as have the greatest power to make the soul he looks to, more solid and servent in the Love of God, as of his last end. For the substance of actions, the nobler actions fit the nobler souls, and so are to be proposed unto them; and, as no body can doubt but that

is better to hinder a soul from going to purgatory, and much more from going to Hell, then to free it out of purgatory, for actions which cause men to be good in this world are more to be recommended to comprehensive souls. But if any one thorough subjectness to passion, and shortness of discourse, is more moved to Charity by corporeal apprehensions then by strength of reason, this praying for the dead is well proposed to him. Though the truth is, it doth enervate the perfection of Charity, not so much in it self by entrenching upon true resignation, but also concerning the special fruit of praying for the dead: of which the wise man admonishes us, saying, it is better going to the house of weeping then to the house of banqueting, because in the former we are put in mind of the end of all men. And *J. M.* himself cites out of *St. Austin*, that when we celebrate the days of our dead Brethren, we ought to have in our mind that which is to be hoped, and that which is to be feared; that is to say, *the day of Judgment*. What a strange humour then is this of men who pretend to devotion, to cast away the substantial, certain, and ever in all Antiquity practised part of praying for the dead, to set up a new, fallacious, uncertain way;

Devotion and Reason.

303

way, against the orders of the Church forbidding *divines* to be taught publicly to the people, against the perfection of those who pray, to whom they preach to determine God, and to desire a particular effect, of which we neither have any promise that it shall be granted, nor know whether it stands with Gods providence, and even common rules of Government. Let then Priests say their Masses and Offices according to the words they find in their Missals and Ceremonials, and not frame senses that are not in the words. Let them pray as all the former Church hath done, and not frame out of Origenical or Chilistical Principles, new inventions, to magnify themselves by having some privileges, or more power then others. Let them first make it plain, that what they profess hath better grounds then such as the Popes call the *dreams* of devout Persons in their prayers, before they impose upon our belief new Articles of Faith. Let them not oblige Divines to think that falsities may be solidly connected with Faith, and such like Doctrins destructive of Truth and Religion, and Devotion.

I pray also inquire where he found those words in St. *Austin*, whence he father'd that
gross

gross absurdity upon him, that some should be damned for want of time to be prayed for. For I read the Chapter he cites twice over, and could espy nothing like it

Your Servant T. W.

Errata.

P. 45. l. 25. as this, is. 48. l. 17. in *last* *manus.* 63. l. 28. *sworn.*
65. l. 19. *struggle.* 66. l. 11. *alt.* alter the story. 67. l. 12. *their* *Inquisi-*
tion. 68. l. 11. *severe.* l. 20. *consider* *both* *much* *the* *arguments* *of* *this.*
77. l. 27. *we* *acknowledg.* 109. l. 28. *that;* the Pope. 154. l. 28. *If* *this*
way. 160. l. 18. *for* *fear* *of* *being.* l. 28. *knowing.* 180. l. 6. *then* *we*
judge. 181. l. 25. *if* *mine.* 182. l. 15. *Alcuinus.* 183. l. 24. *essence* *of* *184.*
18. *and* *whether.* 180. l. 20. *not* *sure.* 196. l. 6. *by* *us.* 242. l. 23. *changes*
60. 249. l. 16. *Peripatetic.* 253. l. 2. *for* *us.*

FINIS.

A Short Letter sent after the former.

Since I writ the former, I have found commanding to see the cited Books which before I wanted, And can give this account of them. The Author of the Oration imposed upon St. John Damascen is an unexcusable Heretick: The intent of the Oration to persuade men that however they live, they may come to Heaven by other mens Prayers. He puts Infidels to have been deliver'd out of Hell by our Saviour Jesus Christ at his descension; which St. Gregory declared to be Heresie. He puts perfect good works without Faith, against the constant Doctrine of St. Paul, which is perfect Pelagianism. He puts that the Heretick Philosophers knew almost all the Mysteries of our Faith, as much as we hear of the Sibyls. And to make it wholly sure that he is an Heretick, he doth more then half profess his Doctrine is his own invention, and that he has evinced against the Prophet, saying; In inferno quis confitebitur tibi; and against the present persuasion of Christians, that there is confession in Hell.

As for Gennadius, whom he presses likewise, he is of the same stamp. He teaches St. John Damascen found this Doctrin of praying for the damned; He takes the whole sum of Doctrin out of that Oration. He onely causen'd the Latin Fathers in pretending in common to bold prayer for the dead; And being returned into Grece joyn'd with Marcus Ephesinus, to annul the Union made in the Council of Florence.

The work of St. Hidor I find to be none of his, but of some Authour who lived about the beginning of the Schools, he so perfectly useth the School-terms; and so his Authority is no more then of a School-Doctör.

As for St. Julian of Toledo, it is true, that he holds the opinion of our Adversaries, but so that he confutes their intention. For having proposed the question, he is so far from saying it was the opinion of the Church, that he resolves it as upon his own head, and that uncertainly, with a Puto, I think, alleading St. Austin for his saying, whose sentence you have heard examined already. So that his Authority is no greater then his ghefs, that so it is; as St. Austin gheffed there might be some such thing. So that we have out of St. Julian that it was not the credulity, or received opinion in his days. By which you will understand

stand how small performances accompany the good mans great boastings. And see the growing of their opinion. St. Austin ghesse'd it possible at most, for he professes onely not to oppose it. The Authour of the Dialogues credited unlikely Revelations. St. Julian ghesse'd it positively. St. Odilo and those who follow'd him, took it up for certain upon private Revelations. The later Greeks upon the like Revelations took praying for damned souls; And upon the combining of these two, your great Doctour seeks to make it an Article of Faith. These short Notes I thought fit to acquaint you with to compleat your satisfaction, which done I rest

Your Servant

Tho. White.

F I N I S.